THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS:

Tho. Wotton — OR, Jure mortuus

The *MASS* Dead and buried, without hope of Resurrection.

Translated out of *French*.

The Fourth Edition, Corrected.

[David Deodon]

LONDON,

Printed for *Randal Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*, 1680.

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW YORK

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
FRED'K M. BIRD.

To the Right Honourable

The EARL

OF

SHAFTESBURY,

Lord High Chancellour

OF

ENGLAND, &c.

My Lord,

I Could not without injuſtice, have Dedicated this Book to any but your Lord-

 ſhip,

ſhip, becauſe, as there is no perſon to whom I am ſo much obliged, ſo there is no member of either Houſe of Parliament that hath ſo freely and generouſly owned the Proteſtant intereſt. As for my obligations to your Lordſhip, becauſe they are too great to be expreſt, it is my duty to take all occaſions of expreſſing my thankfulneſs for them, and therefore I take this occaſion to proclaim my thankfulneſs to the World. As for your Lordſhips late owning the Proteſtant intereſt in the Houſe of Peers, it was ſo eminent, and accompanied with ſuch zeal and courage, that (next under God

and

and the King) your Lordſhip may deſervedly be ſtiled the chief aſſerter and promoter of it, and conſequently the aſſerter and promoter of the intereſt of *England*. For the intereſt of the Proteſtant Religion, and the intereſt of this Kingdom, are ſo interwoven, that the welfare or ruine of either, is the welfare or ruine of both. Now being obliged by your Lordſhip, both as an *Engliſh* Proteſtant, and alſo more particularly in my private capacity, I beſeech God to grant that your life may be long and proſperous, your memory and poſterity honourable, as long as the

Sun and Moon shall endure, and your soul and body eternally happy when time shall be no more. To this Prayer I shall only add, that I am unfeignedly,

My Lord,

Your Lordships,

Most affectionate honourer,

and most humble Servant,

S. A.

The

THE PREFACE.

THe Author of this Piece was one *Monſieur de Rodon*, Philoſophy Profeſſor in the Royal College at *Niſmes*, a City of *Languedoc* in *France*, where it was written. But as ſoon as it was Printed, it was ſuppreſt by the command of Authority, prohibiting all perſons to keep any of them, upon I know not what ſevere penalties; and ſuch Copies as could be found, were publickly burnt by the Hangman, about 1660. Whereupon the poor Gentleman, for fear of being condemned to keep company with his Books, was forced to fly to *Geneva*, where he not long after died. Theſe ſeverities of our Adverſaries bring to my remembrance what a learned and ingenious *Frenchman* once told me, *viz.* That this ſmall Tract hath more netled their Par-

ty, than any one Piece that ever was extant in *France* ſince the Reformation of Religion there. Whether that be a miſtake, I know not; but this I dare affirm, That though many famous men of that Kingdom have, in the memory of this Age, written very ſmartly againſt the *Romiſh* Hereſies, yet there is not one of them whoſe Perſon and Writings have had ſuch hard meaſure. Whence it appears, that our Author (his very Enemies being Judges) hath made good what he undertook, *viz.* He hath deſtroyed that great *Diana* the *Maſs*, and hath alſo, by way of prevention, deſtroyed all the Arguments made uſe of by the *Romiſh* Doctors for the reſtoring and re-eſtabliſhing of her: which he hath ſo well performed, that to this very day, not one of them hath dared ſo much as to attempt to revive her, by anſwering his Book; ſo that here you may ſee her laid in her Grave, without hope of Reſurrection: and therefore the

Book

Book may very fitly be termed, *The Funeral of the Maſs*; and conſequently, The Funeral of *Romiſh* Hereſies and Idolatries, as the Author well obſerves. For the truth is, the *Maſs* and the *Romiſh Religion* are almoſt convertible Terms; ſo that if the former be deſtroyed, the latter muſt vaniſh into its firſt Nothing: and therefore our Author having deſtroyed the *Maſs*, hath deſtroyed the thing called *Popery* too. As for the monſtrous Abſurdities and Blaſphemies which flow from this one *Romiſh* Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*, they would fill whole Volumes; but I ſhall content my ſelf to ſay, That the *Maſs* conſiſts of more groſs and abominable Superſtitions, Phanaticiſms, and Idolatries, than ever have been believed or practiſed by the moſt ignorant *Pagans*. What the Tenets of the *Romaniſts* are, and what their Practices have been in reference to *Proteſtant* Magiſtrates and People, woful and ſad experience hath

ſuffi-

ſufficiently taught the World. I ſhall onely add, That they are as pernicious to our Bodies and Eſtates, as their Heretical Doctrines, and Idolatrous Services are to our Souls. And conſequently, to introduce *Popery* into this Kingdom, would be an act as unpolitick as Antichriſtian, as hath been demonſtrated in that incomparable Piece entituled, *The Eſtabliſhed Religion, in oppoſition to Popery*. But becauſe (I know not by what ſtrange infatuation or enchantment, or rather by what wonderful Judgment of God) this monſtrous, abſurd, and deſtructive (ſhall I call it?) Religion prevails amongſt us, I thought good to Engliſh and Print this ſmall Treatiſe, as the beſt Antidote againſt *Popery* (the Holy Scripture excepted) that ever I read; and for ought I know, it is not inferior to the beſt of this kind that ever was yet extant: to which opinion the harſh uſage it hath had from our Adverſaries, as aforeſaid, doth certainly

ly give no ſmall teſtimony. But I know that the Holy Scripture it ſelf cannot profit, except God be pleaſed to give his Bleſſing, much leſs can this Book: and therefore I earneſtly beſeech him, That he would make it proſperous and ſucceſsful, for the good of Souls; and if any ſhall receive benefit by it, I deſire them to give him all the glory, and then I ſhall think my ſelf infinitely recompenſed for my pains in tranſlating it.

The

The Contents of these Chapters.

Chap. I.

1. *Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words,* This is my Body. Page, 1.

Chap. II

2. *Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words,* He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life. My fleſh is meat indeed, *&c.* 10.

Chap. III.

3. *Againſt Tranſubſtantiation.* 19.

Chap. IV.

4. *Againſt the real preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt or conſecrated Wafer.* 32.

Chap. V.

5. *Againſt the adoration or worſhiping of the Hoſt.* 58.

Chap. VI.

6. *Againſt the taking away of the Cup.* 82.

Chap. VII.

7. *Againſt the Maſs.* 95.

Chap. VIII.

8. *Containing anſwers to the objections of the* Romiſh *Doctors.* 117.

THE

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.

THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words, *This is my Body.*

THE Romaniſts are wont to tell us, that theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *This is my Body*, are ſo clear to prove the Real Preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt, and conſequently to prove Tranſubſtantiation (or the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread into Chriſts Body) that they

they are amazed we cannot perceive ſo manifeſt a truth. Againſt which I form this Argument: He that ſpeaks contrary to the uſage of all the World, and takes words otherwiſe than all other men do, muſt without doubt, ſpeak very obſcurely: But if Jeſus Chriſt by theſe words, *This is my Body*, had meant the real preſence of his Body in the Hoſt (as the *Romiſh* Doctors aſſert) and conſequently had meant the ſubſtatial converſion of the Bread into his Body, he had ſpoken contrary to the common uſage of all the World, and hath taken the words otherwiſe than all other men do, which I thus prove. There was never any Author either ſacred, or prophane, that made uſe of ſuch words as theſe, *This is my Body*, to ſignifie the ſubſtantial converſion of one thing into another; or to ſignifie the real preſence of a thing immediately after the pronouncing of them, and not before. On the contrary, there was never any man that did not uſe them to ſignifie, that the thing was already that which it was ſaid to be. For example; When God the Father, ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaid, *This is my beloved Son*, it is certain that Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of God before God ſaid it: and in common uſage it is never ſaid this is that, except the thing be ſo before it is ſaid to be ſo. For example;

ample; We do not ſay *this is a Table*, before that, which we mean by the word *this*, be a Table. Therefore it is contrary to the common ſtile of all Authors, as well ſacred as prophane, and contrary to the common uſage of all men, to make theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *This is my Body*, to ſignifie the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread into Chriſts Body, and the real preſence of his Body in the Hoſt immediately after the pronouncing of them by the Prieſt, and not before. Seeing then that Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, did not ſpeak contrary to the common uſage of all the World, and did not take the words otherwiſe than all other men do, it neceſſarily follows that theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *This is my Body*, do not ſignifie the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread into Chriſts Body, nor the real preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt immediately after the Prieſt hath pronounced them, and not before. And this being ſo, the *Romiſh* Doctors muſt ſeek ſome other paſſages of Scripture, than this, *This is my Body*, to prove ſuch a converſion, and ſuch a preſence; and ſeeing they can find none, I conclude that ſuch a converſion, and ſuch a preſence, have no foundation in holy Scripture.

2. That which I have ſaid concerning com-

common uſage is founded on this reaſon, *viz.* becauſe things muſt be before there can be any Image, Picture, or Repreſentation of them, and conſequently Images are after the things, whereof they are Images: But words are the Images of conceptions, and conceptions the Images of things: Therefore things are ſuch before we can really conceive them to be ſuch, and we conceive them to be ſuch, before we can ſay they are ſuch. Therefore that which Jeſus Chriſt held, and gave to his Diſciples, expreſſed by the word *this*, was his body, before he conceived that it was his body, and he conceived that it was his body, before he ſaid *This is my Body*; and conſequently it is not by vertue of theſe words, *This is my Body*, that that which Jeſus Chriſt gave to his Diſciples, expreſſed by the word *this*, was his Body; but rather it is by bleſſing the bread, or thankſgiving, that the bread was made the Body of Chriſt, becauſe it was made the Sacrament of it. Whence it follows that theſe words, *this is my body*, muſt be expounded thus, *this bread is my body*; and theſe words, *this bread is my body*, muſt be expounded thus, *this bread is the Sacrament of my body*; which I prove thus:

3. A Propoſition muſt be expounded according

cording to the nature of the thing in queſtion; for example, If a man, pointing at the Kings Perſon, ſhould ſay, *this is the King*, the Propoſition muſt be expounded thus, *this is the Kings Perſon*, becauſe the Kings Perſon is meant: But if a man coming into a Painters Shop, and pointing at the Kings Picture, ſhould ſay, *this is the King*, the Propoſition muſt be expounded thus, *this is the Kings Picture*; becauſe here his Picture is meant. Even ſo if Jeſus Chriſt laying his hand on his Breaſt, had ſaid this is my Body, we muſt without doubt have underſtood the Propoſition concerning his real Body, and not concerning the Sign, or Sacrament of it; becauſe his very Body had been then meant, and not the Sign or Sacrament of it: But Jeſus Chriſt, being about to inſtitute the Euchariſt, and to that end, having taken bread, bleſſed it, and given it to his Diſciples with theſe words, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, it is evident that they muſt be underſtood of the Sacrament of his Body, and the Propoſition muſt be expounded thus, *this is the Sacrament of my Body*, becauſe here the Sacrament of his Body is meant. And ſeeing a Sacrament is a viſible ſign of an inviſible grace, as the Council of *Trent* ſaith in its ſixth Seſſion, it is evident that this Propoſition, *this is my Body*, being expounded by this, *this is the*

Sacra-

Sacrament of my Body, may be expounded thus, *this is the ſign of my Body*; which I confirm thus:

4. In theſe two Propoſitions, *This is my body*, *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood*, the word [*is*] muſt be taken in the ſame ſenſe, becauſe they are alike, having been pronounced upon the ſame matter, *viz.* the one upon one part of the Sacrament, and the other upon the other part of it; and becauſe of like things we muſt give a like judgment. But in this Propoſition, *this cup is the New Teſtament*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and tranſubſtantiated being; but for a Sacramental and ſignificative being: becauſe neither the cup, nor that which is in the cup, is changed into a Teſtament; neither is it really and properly a Teſtament, but the Sacrament of the New Teſtament. Therefore in this Propoſition likewiſe, *this is my body*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and tranſubſtantiated being; but for a Sacramental and ſignificative being: and conſequently as this Propoſition, *this cup is the New Teſtament*, muſt be expounded thus; the Wine that is in the cup is the ſign and Sacrament of the New Teſtament: So this Propoſition, *this is my body*, muſt be expounded thus, this Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body.

Whence

Whence it follows that in one ſingle Propoſition of Jeſus Chriſt in the inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, *viz. this cup is the New Teſtament*, there are two figures, one in the word *Cup*, being taken for that which is in the cup; this is a figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the thing containing is taken for the thing contained. The other Figure is, that the cup is called the New Teſtament: this alſo is a Figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the ſign is called by the name of the thing ſignified. And therefore the *Romiſh* Doctors are miſtaken when they tell us that all that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid when he inſtituted the Euchariſt, muſt be taken literally, and without a figure. But withal we muſt not imagine that Jeſus Chriſt ſpake obſcurely, becauſe he ſpake figuratively, theſe figures and manners of ſpeech, being commonly and familiarly uſed by all the World.

5. But when we ſay that theſe words, *this is my body*, *this is my blood*, muſt be expounded thus, this Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body, this Wine is the Sign and Sacrament of my Blood, we do not mean that the Bread and Wine are barely and ſimply ſigns of Chriſts Body and Blood; but we believe that the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt are ſigns that do exhibit the body and

and blood of Chriſt to believers: For when they do, by the mouth of the body receive the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt, they do at the ſame time, by the mouth of the ſoul, *viz.* by Faith, receive the Body of Chriſt broken, and his Blood ſhed for the remiſſion of their ſins, as will be proved in the next Chapter.

6. Add hereunto this one Argument: When a man ſaith that a thing is ſuch, if it be not ſuch, during the whole time, which he imploys in ſaying it is ſuch, he makes a falſe Propoſition. For example, When a man ſaith that a Wall is white, if it be not white, during the whole time he imploys in ſaying it is white, he makes a falſe Propoſition. But (according to the *Romiſh* Doctors) when Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *this is my body*, it was not his body during the whole time which he imployed in ſaying *this is my body*; for, they ſay, it was his body afterward only: Therefore, according to the *Romiſh* Doctors, Jeſus Chriſt uttered a falſe Propoſition: which being blaſphemous to affirm, we muſt lay down this for a foundation, that that which Jeſus Chriſt gave his Diſciples, when he ſaid, *this is my body*, was his body, not only after he had ſaid it, but alſo while he was ſaying it, and before he ſaid it. And here we have this advantage

tage of thoſe of the *Romiſh* Church, that we believe the truth of theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *this is my body*, much better than they do; becauſe they believe it at one time only, *viz.* after he had ſaid it: but we believe it at three ſeveral times, *viz.* before he ſaid it, when he was ſaying it, and after he had ſaid it. But here ſome may object that we muſt not take the words of our Lord in too rigorous a ſenſe, and that in theſe words, *this is my body*, we muſt take the Preſent tenſe for the next Future, and then the ſenſe will be this, this will immediately be my body. To which I anſwer, that the *Romiſh* Doctors will have us take theſe words, *this is my body*, in the rigour of the literal ſenſe, and then the Propoſition is evidently falſe. I know that the Preſent tenſe may be taken for the next Future, as when Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *I go to my Father, and to your Father; I go to my God, and to your God*: that is, I ſhall go ſpeedily. But who can be ſo bold and ignorant as to affirm that this ſpeech is without a Figure, ſeeing all Grammarians know that it is a Figure call'd *Enallage* of time? Therefore the *Romiſh* Doctors muſt confeſs, that by their own doctrine this Propoſition of Jeſus Chriſt, *this is my body*, is either falſe or figurative; and that ſeeing it is not falſe, it muſt be figurative,

tive, and that the figure must be a *Metonymie* whereby the sign takes the name of the thing signified (as hath already been proved) and not an Enallage of time.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Exposition of these words, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life. My flesh is meat indeed* &c.

1. IN this Chapter I shall prove that Jesus Christ speaks of a spiritual eating and drinking by Faith, and not of a corporeal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body. My first Argument is this: When a man would satisfie his hunger, and quench his thirst, he eateth, and drinketh that thing which he hungers and thirsts after; because eating satisfieth hunger, and drinking quencheth thirst: But it is by Faith, that is, by believing in Jesus Christ, that we satisfie the hunger, and quench the thirst which we have after Christ; for it is in the sixth of St. *John*, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.*

thirſt: Therefore it is by Faith or by believing, that we eat and drink Jeſus Chriſt; and conſequently the eating of Chriſts fleſh, and drinking his blood is ſpiritual, and not corporal.

2. My ſecond Argument is this: Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, *He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.* And *except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, John 6. But it is the ſpiritual eating and drinking by Faith that gives life eternal, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body; becauſe many Reprobates (according to the very doctrine of *Rome* it ſelf) do corporally eat the fleſh, and drink the blood of Chriſt and yet ſhall not inherit eternal life.

3. The third Argument is taken from S. *Auguſtine*, and Cardinal *Cajetan*, who expound the words of Jeſus Chriſt as we do. St. *Auguſtin* in Book 3. of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, ſpeaketh thus, *To eat the fleſh of Chriſt is a figure, teaching us to partake of Chriſts Paſſion, and to imprint in our memories with delight and profit, that Chriſt was crucified for us.* Card. *Cajetan* in his Commentary on St. *John* 6. ſaith, *To eat the fleſh of Chriſt, and drink his blood, is faith in Chriſts death; ſo that the ſenſe is this, if you uſe not the death of the Son of man*

as meat and drink, ye ſhall not have the life of the Spirit in you. And having ſufficiently proved his Expoſition, he adds: *To eat and drink the Sacrament is a thing common, as well to thoſe that eat unworthily, as to thoſe that eat worthily; but that which Jeſus Chriſt here ſpeaks of, is not common to both, for he ſaith, he that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; he ſaith not he that eateth worthily and drinketh worthily, but he that eateth and drinketh.* Whence it clearly appears, that according to the Letter, he ſpeaks not of eating and drinking the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but of eating and drinking the death of Jeſus Chriſt.

4. Now that we may clearly underſtand this doctrine, we muſt conſider, wherein the life which Jeſus Chriſt gives us, doth conſiſt; for ſeeing the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is meat to us, becauſe it gives us life; it is evident that if we know what life that is which Jeſus Chriſt gives us, we muſt know likewiſe how Jeſus Chriſt is meat to us, and conſequently how we eat him. But to know what that life is which Jeſus Chriſt gives us, we muſt conſider what that death is in which we were involved, which is expreſſed by St. *Paul, Epheſ.* 2. in theſe words: *When we are dead in ſins and treſpaſſes God hath quickned us together*

ther with Christ: by grace ye are saved, and consequently the death in which we were involved, consists in two things, first in the curse of the Law, which imports the privation of felicity, and the suffering of temporal and eternal punishment for our Sins. Secondly it consists in an habitual corruption, whereby sin raigns in us; and therefore it is said 1 *Tim.* 5. *The widow that lives in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* Also sins are called *dead works*, *Heb.* 10. So that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in two things. First, In deliverance from the curse of the Law by the pardon of our sins, as St. *Paul* tells us *Coloss.* 2. *God hath quickned you together with Christ, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the obligation that was against us*; which obligation proceeded from the Law, because it did oblige all the transgressors of it to a curse. Secondly, It consists in regeneration, or sanctification, whereof Jesus Christ speaking in *John* 3. saith, *Except a man be born again he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*: and St. *Paul*, *Heb.* 12. *Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* Therefore seeing that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in the pardon of our sins, and in our regeneration, and sanctification, which ends in

glorification; and that Jeſus Chriſt is called meat in reference to this life, we muſt conſider the means, whereby Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed theſe things for us; and ſeeing it is certain, that his death is the means by which he hath purchaſed pardon of ſins, and regeneration, we muſt conclude that Jeſus Chriſt is the food and nouriſhment of our ſouls in regard of the merit of his death. But that Jeſus Chriſt by his death hath purchaſed life for us, (that is juſtification, which conſiſts in the pardon of our ſins, and regeneration, which conſiſts in holineſs of life) appears by theſe paſſages of Scripture; *viz. We are juſtified by the blood of Chriſt, and reconciled to God by his Death.* Rom. 5. *We have redemption by his blood, even the remiſſion of ſins.* Epheſ. 1. *He hath reconciled us in the body of his fleſh by his death, that he may preſent us holy, without ſpot, and blameleſs in his ſight.* Coll. 1. *We are ſanctified by the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all* Heb. 10. *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water by the word, that he might preſent it unto himſelf a glorious Church, &c. Eph.* 5. Therefore ſeeing Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed life for us by his death, and that his fleſh and blood are our meat and drink (becauſe they

pur-

purchaſed life eternal for us on the Croſs, *viz.* the remiſſion of our ſins, and ſanctification, ending in glorification) it follows that the action whereby Jeſus Chriſt is applied to us for righteouſneſs and ſanctification, is the ſame by which we eat the fleſh of Chriſt, and drink his blood. But this action is nothing elſe but Faith, as the Scripture tells us: *Being juſtified by faith we have peace with God.* Rom. 5. *God purifies our hearts by faith.* Act. 15. *He that believeth hath eternal life.* John 6. From what hath been ſaid I form this Argument. That Action whereby we obtain remiſſion of ſins, and ſanctification, ending in glorification, is the ſame, whereby we have that life, which Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed for us by his death; becauſe that life principally conſiſts in the remiſſion of ſins, and ſanctification, as we have proved. But the ſpiritual eating, and drinking by faith, and not the corporal by the mouth, is that action, whereby we obtain remiſſion of ſins, and ſanctification, as we have alſo proved. Therefore the ſpiritual eating and drinking by faith is the action, whereby we have that life, which Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed for us by his death, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth. And conſequently ſeeing in St. *John* 6. a

certain eating and drinking is ſpoken of, whereby we have that life which Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed for us by his death; it is evident that a ſpiritual eating and drinking is there ſpoken of, and not a corporal.

5. From what hath been ſaid it appears, that when Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, *my fleſh is meat indeed*, &c. the figure falls upon the word *meat*, which is taken not for corporal but ſpiritual meat. The reaſon whereof is, that corporal food is that which is appointed for the nouriſhment of the body, as ſpiritual food is that which is appointed for the nouriſhment of the ſoul; ſo that although corporal food be taken by the mouth of the body, yet that only doth not make it to be corporal food, except it be taken for the nouriſhment of the body; otherwiſe poiſon, medicine, a bullet, *&c.* which a man ſhould ſwallow would be corporal food; which is abſurd to affirm. But the fleſh of Chriſt, which is pretended to be eaten in the Euchariſt by the mouth of the body, is not appointed for the nouriſhment of the body; becauſe that food which is appointed for the nouriſhment of the body is changed into the ſubſtance of the body: but the body of Chriſt is not changed into the ſubſtance of our bodies: Therefore the fleſh of

Chriſt

Chriſt is not a corporal food, but his fleſh broken, and his blood ſhed on the Croſs, is a ſpiritual food which nouriſheth the ſouls of thoſe, who by a true and lively faith, do embrace this fleſh broken, and this blood ſhed; that is, who do wholly reſt and rely on the merit of his death and paſſion for obtaining mercy from God. And certainly, ſeeing that the life which Jeſus Chriſt gives us by his death, is ſpiritual, that the nouriſhment is ſpiritual, that the eating his Body and drinking his Blood, is ſpiritual (as hath been proved) it follows that his fleſh muſt be ſpiritual meat, and his blood ſpiritual drink. And this fleſh of Chriſt is incomparably better, and more truly meat indeed in regard of its effects, than corporal food can be, becauſe it doth better, and more perfectly nouriſh the ſouls of Believers than corporal food doth their bodies; this being corruptible food which gives temporal life only; but that ſpiritual and incorruptible food which gives life eternal.

6. I conclude this Chapter with this conſideration. When a doctrine is propoſed which is pretended to be divine, and that paſſages of holy Scripture are alledged for the proof of it, if it oppoſeth, or ſeems to oppoſe ſenſe and reaſon, and to include con-

tradictions; and that a more ſutable and rational ſenſe can be found out for thoſe paſſages, ſo that all theſe inconveniences and contradictions may be avoided; there is nothing more juſt than that we ſhould embrace that probable and rational ſenſe, and reject that doctrine which oppoſeth ſenſe and reaſon, and ſeems to imply contradictions: But the doctrine of the real preſence of the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt, and the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread into his Body, is repugnant to ſenſe and reaſon, and ſeems to include diverrs contradictions; (*viz.* that a humane body is in a point without any local extenſion, that a body may be in divers places at one and the ſame time, that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which were before; that accidents may be without a ſubject, &c.) And the paſſages that are impertinently alledged to prove ſuch a preſence, and ſuch a change, have a ſenſe very commodious and rational, for the avoiding all theſe contradictions, as appears in this and the former Chapter, where I have very rationally expounded thoſe two paſſages which the *Romiſh* Doctors impertinently make uſe of for this ſubject. Therefore they ought to embrace that commodious and

ra-

rational ſenſe which we have given them; and to reject the doctrine of the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt, and the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

CHAP. III.

Againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

1. TRanſubſtantiation is the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which I deſtroy by divers Arguments; the firſt whereof is this:

In every ſubſtantial converſion, that thing into which another thing is converted, is always newly produced. For example, when ſeed is converted into an animal, that animal is newly produced; when Jeſus Chriſt turned the water into wine, the wine was newly produced, *&c.* But the Body and Blood of Chriſt cannot be newly produced in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt: Therefore the Bread and Wine are not ſubſtantially converted into the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. The

second Proposition, *viz.* that the Body and Blood of Christ cannot be newly produced, I prove thus: That which is newly produced receives a new being; because to produce a thing, and to give it a being is one and the same: But the Body and Blood of Christ cannot receive a new being, which I prove thus: A man cannot receive that which he hath, while he hath it, and therefore he cannot receive a being while he hath a being; for as it is impossible to take away a being from that which hath no being; so it is impossible to give a being to that which hath a being already: and as you cannot kill a dead man, so you cannot give life to one that is living. But the Body and Blood of Christ have, and always will have a being: Therefore they cannot receive one, and consequently cannot be reproduced in the Eucharist.

2. My second Argument is this. In every substantial conversion, that thing which is converted into another is destroyed. For example, When the water was turned into wine, the water was destroyed: But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the Bread and Wine are not destroyed by the Consecration; which I prove thus: In the celebration of the Eucharist there is breaking, giving,

ving, eating and drinking after the conſecration, as appears by the very practice of our Adverſaries, who after conſecration, break the Hoſt, and divide it into three parts, give nothing to the Communicants but conſecrated Hoſts, and eat and drink nothing but what was conſecrated: But the Scripture ſaith, that in the celebration of the Euchariſt, Bread is broken, that Bread and Wine are given, and that Bread is eaten and Wine drank, as appears by theſe following paſſages. St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 10. ſaith, *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt*; and 1 *Cor.* 11. Saint *Matth.* 26. St. *Mark* 14. and St. *Luke* 22. it is ſaid that *Jeſus Chriſt took bread, brake it and gave it*; and St. *Mark* 14. and St. *Matth.* 26. Jeſus Chriſt after he had participated of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ſaith, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine*: and 1 *Cor.* 11. *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup. Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.*

3. Secondly, When Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to his Diſciples, *Drink ye all of this*, St. *Matth.* 26. that is, drink ye all of this cup, either he commanded to drink of a cup of Wine or of a cup of Blood: if he commanded them

them to drink of a cup of Wine, then it follows that they drank nothing but Wine, becauſe it is certain that they obeyed Jeſus Chriſt; for it is ſaid St. *Mark* 14. that *they all drank of it.* Or if he commanded them to drink of a cup of Blood, then it follows that the Wine was already changed into his Blood, becauſe it is not probable that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to them, Drink ye all of this cup of Blood, and yet that it was not a cup of Blood, but a cup of Wine. But when Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *Drink ye all of this*, he did not ſpeak to them of a cup of Blood, for the Wine was not then converted into Chriſt's Blood, becauſe (according to our Adverſaries) it was not changed until Jeſus Chriſt had made an end of uttering theſe following words, *for this is my blood.* But he uttered theſe words, *Drink ye all of this*, before he uttered thoſe, *for this is my Blood*, becauſe a man muſt utter a Propoſition before he can give the reaſon of it.

4. Thirdly, When a thing is converted into another, we cannot ſee the effects and properties of the thing converted, but only of that into which it is converted. For Example, When the ſeed is changed into an animal, we can ſee no more the effects and properties of the ſeed, but of the animal only;

only; and when Jeſus Chriſt turned the Water into Wine, the effects, properties, and accidents of the Water were no more ſeen, but of the Wine only, *&c.* But in the Euchariſt we cannot, after the conſecration, perceive the effects, properties, accidents, or parts of the Body and Blood of Chriſt; but we ſee there all the effects, properties, and accidents of Bread and Wine: Therefore in the Euchariſt, the Bread and Wine are not converted into the Body and Blood of Chriſt. And the truth is, if that which appears to be Bread, and hath all the effects, accidents, and properties of Bread, be not Bread, but Chriſt's Body cloathed with the accidents of Bread; then it may likewiſe be ſaid that they that appear to be men, and have all the effects, properties, and accidents of men, are not men, but horſes cloathed with the accidents of men.

5. The fourth Argument is this. In every ſubſtantial converſion there muſt be a ſubject to paſs from one ſubſtance to another; for then it would be a Creation, which is the ſole action that doth not preſuppoſe a ſubject. But in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, after the conſecration, there is no ſubject; becauſe, according to our Adverſaries

ſaries, there remains no ſubject; for, as they aſſert, the accidents of Bread and Wine remain without any ſubject at all: Therefore in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt there is no ſubſtantial converſion.

6. The fifth Argument is drawn from hence, That Tranſubſtantiation deſtroys the nature of accidents, thus. That doctrine which aſſerts that accidents are not accidents but ſubſtances, deſtroys the nature and eſſence of accidents, becauſe it is impoſſible that an accident can be a ſubſtance. But the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation aſſerts that accidents are not accidents, but that they are ſubſtances, which I prove thus. That doctrine which aſſerts that accidents are not inherent, but that they ſubſiſt of themſelves, doth aſſert that accidents are not accidents, but that they are ſubſtances, becauſe inherent is the eſſential difference of an accident, and ſubſiſtence. But the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation aſſerts that accidents are not inherent, but that they ſubſiſt, which I prove thus. That doctrine which aſſerts that accidents may be without a ſubject, doth aſſert that accidents are not inherent in a ſubject, but that they ſubſiſt by themſelves: But the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation aſſerts that accidents may be without a ſubject,

ſubject, *viz.* the accidents of Bread and Wine without any ſubſtance, and without any ſubject to ſuſtain them; for by Tranſubſtantiation the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is gone, and their accidents remain: Therefore the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation aſſerts that accidents are not inherent, but do ſubſiſt by themſelves, and conſequently aſſerts that accidents are not accidents, but ſubſtances, and ſo deſtroys the nature and eſſence of accidents. But here it may be ſaid that actual inherence doth not conſtitute an accident, but aptitudinal only. Againſt which I form this Argument. Whatſoever doth exiſt actually, either it exiſts in ſomething elſe actually, ſo that it cannot be without it, which Philoſophers call actual inherence, as walking: or elſe it exiſts in and by it ſelf actually, ſo that it may be alone by it ſelf, which Philoſophers term *actual exiſtence*; the former of theſe conſtitutes an accident, and the latter conſtitutes a ſubſtance. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine, after conſecration, do exiſt actually: Therefore they muſt exiſt either in ſomething elſe actually, or in themſelves actually. But they do not exiſt in and by themſelves actually, for elſe they would ſubſiſt by themſelves and be real ſubſtances, which is impoſſible: Therefore

Therefore they exiſt in ſomething elſe actually, *viz.* in the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine, and conſequently the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine remains after the Conſecration, and ſo there can be no Tranſubſtantiation.

7. The ſixth Argument is drawn from this, That Tranſubſtantiation deſtroys the nature of Sacraments, becauſe every Sacrament is a viſible ſign of an inviſible grace, as the Council of *Trent* ſaith in *Seſſ.* 6. and every ſign relates to the thing ſignified, ſo that we muſt ſpeak of ſigns and Sacraments, as of things relating to ſomething elſe. But all relative things have, as it were, a double being, *viz.* an abſolute being which is the natural being of the thing, and a relative being whereby it relates to ſomething elſe. For example, In a man that hath begotten a child, we conſider his abſolute and natural being as he is a man as others are, and his relative being, whereby he is a Father, and is diſtinguiſhed from other men that have no children, and ſo are not Fathers. So in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, the ſign, *viz.* the Water, hath an abſolute and natural being, *viz.* its cold and moiſt ſubſtance, whereby it is water as other waters are; and a relative, ſacramental, and ſignificative be-

ing

ing, whereby it is the ſign and Sacrament of Chriſts Blood, and differs from other waters that are not imployed for this ſacred uſe: Even ſo in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, the Bread and Wine, which are the ſigns, have their natural and abſolute being, *viz.* their ſubſtance whereby they are Bread and Wine, as other Bread and Wine, which we commonly uſe; and their relative, ſacramental, and ſignificative being, whereby they are the Sacrament and ſigns of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and differ from all other Bread and Wine that is not thus imployed. To this I add, That it is impoſſible a relative being ſhould be without an abſolute, becauſe a relative cannot be without its foundation. For example, It is impoſſible to be a Father without being a Man; to be equal without quantity, *&c.* And this being granted, I form my Argument thus, That which takes away the natural being from ſigns and Sacraments, deſtroys their nature and eſſence; becauſe the relative and ſacramental being cannot be without the abſolute and natural, as hath been proved. But the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation deſtroys the natural being of the Bread and Wine, which are ſigns and Sacraments of Chriſt's Body and Blood; for by Tranſubſtantiation, the whole ſubſtance

of

of the Bread and Wine is deſtroyed: Therefore the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation deſtroys the nature and eſſence of Sacraments.

8. To this Argument our Adverſaries anſwer, That in the Euchariſt the Bread and Wine are not ſigns, becauſe by the conſecration they are deſtroyed as to their ſubſtance. But ſome of them ſay that the ſigns are the accidents of the Bread and Wine; others ſay that the Body and Blood of Chriſt contained under the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the ſigns of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt crucified; Laſtly, others ſay, that neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt only, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt, together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the ſigns of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt crucified: Therefore ſeeing the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation doth not deſtroy the natural being of Chriſts Body and Blood, nor the natural being of the accidents of the Bread and Wine, they maintain that the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation doth not deſtroy the nature and eſſence of Sacraments.

9. To this I reply, That neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt only, nor the Bo-

dy

dy and Blood of Chriſt together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the true ſigns of Jeſus Chriſt crucified; but the Bread and Wine only, which I prove thus:

Firſt, In Sacraments there ought to be an analogy and ſimilitude between the ſign, and the thing ſignified, as our Adverſaries confeſs, and particularly Card. *Bellarmin*, Book 1. of the *Sacrament*, *chap.* 9. in theſe words. *The fourth thing required in a Sacrament, is that the ſign ſhould have ſome ſimilitude and analogy with the thing ſignified.* And he quotes St. *Auguſtine* in *Epiſt.* 23. to *Boniface*, ſpeaking thus: *If Sacraments had not ſome ſimilitude of the things whereof they are Sacraments they could be no Sacraments:* But in the Sacraments of the Euchariſt, neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt, whether jointly or ſeverally, have that ſimilitude and analogy to the thing ſignified which is required, but only the Bread and Wine in ſubſtance; becauſe that which is principally ſignified, and repreſented by the ſigns in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, is the nouriſhment of our ſouls in the hope of eternal life: for as Baptiſm is the Sacrament of our Regeneration and ſpiritual birth, ſo the Euchariſt is the Sacrament of our ſpiri-

tual

tual nouriſhment, as Card. *Bellarmin* confeſſeth in *Book.* 3. *of the Euchariſt, chap.* 9. and in *Book.* 4. *chap.* 19. he ſaith, *that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt was ordained to preſerve ſpiritual life*, which cannot be repreſented and ſignified, but by ſigns which can nouriſh our bodies; for the analogy and ſimilitude conſiſts in this, that as the ſigns have vertue to nouriſh our bodies for the preſervation of temporal life; ſo the things ſignified, have a vertue to nouriſh our ſouls in the hope of eternal life. But neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt, whether ſeverally or jointly with the accidents, can nouriſh our bodies, (nouriſhment being eſſentially the converſion of aliment into the ſubſtance of a living body,) and it is certain that neither the accidents of Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt, whether ſeparately, or jointly with them, can be converted into our ſubſtance, but only the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and other aliments which we take: Therefore neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Blood of Chriſt, whether ſeparately, or jointly with them, are the true ſigns; but the Bread and Wine only, which being the ordinary nouriſhment of our bodies, do repreſent

preſent to us the ſpiritual nouriſhment of our ſouls by the Body and Blood of Chriſt, received by Faith.

10. Secondly, The Council of *Trent* in *Seſſion* 13. commands that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt ſhall be adored with *Latrie*, which according to our Adverſaries, is the ſovereign worſhip due to God only. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine ought not to be adored, Becauſe they are creatures, and that God only muſt be adored: Therefore the accidents of the Bread and Wine are not the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.

Thirdly, A Sacrament is a viſible ſign of an inviſible grace, as the Council of *Trent* defines it in *Seſſions* 6, and 13. But in the *Euchariſt* the Body and Blood of Chriſt are not viſible: Therefore, in the Euchariſt the body and blood of Chriſt, are not the ſigns.

Laſtly, I ſay, that in every Sacrament the ſign relates to the thing ſignified; and Relation is always between two different things; becauſe nothing relates to it ſelf, and conſequently nothing can be both the ſign and thing ſignified. But the Body and Blood of Chriſt are the things ſignified: Therefore the Body and Blood of Chriſt are not the ſigns. And it is to no purpoſe

to

to ſay that Jeſus Chriſt in the Maſs is the ſign and figure of himſelf on the Croſs; for Jeſus Chriſt whereſoever he is, is one and the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever. And therefore Jeſus Chriſt not being different from himſelf, cannot be relative to himſelf, nor the ſign of himſelf.

Other reaſons which are uſually alledged againſt Tranſubſtantiation will be more properly mentioned in the next Chapter.

CHAP. IV.

Againſt the real preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt, or conſecrated Wafer.

1. THE *Romiſh* Doctors affirm, That immediately after the Prieſt in the celebration of the Maſs, hath pronounced theſe words, *this is my body*, the body of Chriſt is really preſent in the Hoſt, and that it is whole and entire in every part and point of the Hoſt; which Doctrine I deſtroy by theſe following Arguments, the firſt whereof is this.

2. If a thing be created in a place, either it muſt be produced there, or it muſt come,

come, or be brought thither from ſome other place; for it is impoſſible to find out a third way of putting any thing in a place. And the *Romiſh* Doctors have hitherto been able to invent but one of theſe two ways of putting Chriſts Body in the Hoſt, the *Jacobins* telling us that it is brought thither from ſome other place, and the *Jeſuites* that it is produced there. But the body of Chriſt can neither come, nor be brought thither into the Hoſt, nor can it be produced there: Therefore the body of Chriſt is not in the Hoſt.

3. Firſt, The body of Chriſt cannot come, or be brought into the Hoſt from any other place, becauſe it can come from no place but Heaven, being no where but in Heaven. But Chriſts body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Hoſt; which I prove thus: When a body comes, or is carried from one place to another, it muſt leave its firſt place. For example, if a man would go from *Paris* to *Rome*, he muſt leave *Paris*: But the body of Jeſus Chriſt never leaves Heaven; for *the heavens muſt contain him until the time of the reſtitution of all things*, *Acts* 3. Therefore Chriſts body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Hoſt. Beſides, it is impoſſible that Chriſts

Chriſts body ſhould come or be brought into the Hoſt, without paſſing through the ſpace that is between Heaven and Earth, where the conſecrated Hoſts are; becauſe a man cannot paſs from one extream to another without paſſing through the ſpace that is between them. But the ſpace between Heaven and Earth is too vaſt to be paſſed through in a moment (for theſe Doctors will have it, that immediately after the pronouncing of theſe words, *this is my body*, the body of Chriſt is brought into the Hoſt.) Moreover it muſt in a moment be in all the Heavens, and in all the Airs between the higheſt Heaven, and this Earth where the Hoſts are, (becauſe a man cannot paſs through a place without being there) and then it would have three ſorts of exiſtences at once, *viz.* one natural and glorious exiſtence in Heaven, one ſacramental exiſtence in the Hoſt, and one airy exiſtence in the Air. But ſeeing all theſe things are abſurd, we muſt conclude that Chriſts body neither comes, nor is brought into the Hoſt.

4. Secondly, Chriſts body cannot be reproduced in the conſecrated Hoſt, becauſe a thing that is produced already, cannot be produced again, without a preceding deſtru-

destruction; for as a dead man cannot be killed, nor that be annihilated, which is annihilated already; so neither can that be produced which is produced already, nor that receive a being which hath one already. This common conception of all men is founded upon this principle, That every action, whether it produceth or destroyeth a thing, must necessarily have two distinct terms, the one called in the Schools, *terminus à quo*, that is, the term from which the thing comes, and the other *terminus ad quem*, that is, the term to which it comes. But according to this principle, that cannot be annihilated which is so already, nor that receive a being which hath one already; because the term from which it should come, and the term to which it should come, would be one and the same thing; contrary to the Maxim already laid down, *viz.* that the terms of action must necessarily be distinct, and that one of them must be the negation or privation of the other.

5. Here perhaps it may be objected, That by Transubstantiation the substance of Christ's body is not newly produced, but only a new presence of him in the place where the substance of the bread was. But to this I answer, That in all substantial

converſions and actions, a new ſubſtance muſt be produced, as in accidental, a new accident muſt be produced. But Tranſubſtantiation (according to the *Romiſh* Doctors) is a ſubſtantial converſion: Therefore by Tranſubſtantiation a new ſubſtance muſt be produced. And ſeeing that the new preſence of Chriſts body in the place where the ſubſtance of the bread was, is not a ſubſtance, but an accident of the *Categorie* which the Philoſophers call *Vbi*, it is evident that by Tranſubſtantiation the preſence of Chriſts body only is not produced in the place where the ſubſtance of the bread was; and ſeeing that the ſubſtance of Chriſts body is not produced there (as hath been proved in the preceding number) we muſt conclude that there is no Tranſubſtantiation nor real preſence of Chriſt's body in the Hoſt. This inſtance doth alſo deſtroy the adduction of Chriſt's body into the Hoſt, which hath been already refuted in number 3.

6. My ſecond Argument is this. In a true human body ſuch as Chriſts body is, there is ſomething above, and ſomething under, right and left, before and behind; for the head is above the neck, and the neck above the ſhoulders, the ſhoulders above the breaſt;

breaſt, the breaſt above the ſtomach, the ſtomach above the belly, the belly above the thighs, the thighs above the legs, *&c.* But all the World knows that in a point there is nothing above or under, right or left, before or behind: Therefore Chriſt's body is not in a point, and conſequently it is not in every point, or part of the Hoſt. To this I add, that the quantity and greatneſs of Chriſt's body is nothing elſe but its length, breadth, and thickneſs, which cannot be in a point. Laſtly, The quantity of Chriſt's body is nothing elſe but its extent, as we all know; and a body is extended when it hath its parts one without another; that is, they are not one within another, as all the *Jeſuites* expound it. But the doctrine of the preſence of Chriſt's body in the Hoſt, puts all its parts one within another, becauſe it puts them all in a point: Therefore ſuch a doctrine takes away its extent, and conſequently its quantity.

7. My third Argument is this. To move and not to move at the ſame time, to be eaten and not to be eaten at the ſame time, to be in a point and not in a point at the ſame time, to occupy a place and not to occupy it at the ſame time, are contradictory things. But if the body of Chriſt

were in divers conſecrated Hoſts, it would move and not move at the ſame time. For example, When a Prieſt carries a conſecrated Hoſt to a ſick perſon, the body of Chriſt which is pretended to be in it, moves with the Hoſt; for it leaves the Altar, and goes with the Prieſt toward the ſick perſons houſe, and at the ſame time the body of Chriſt, which is pretended to be in the other Hoſts that remain on the Altar, moves not; and ſo the ſame body of Chriſt at the ſame time moves and moves not, which is a contradiction. Seeing then it is impoſſible that one and the ſame body at one and the ſame time ſhould move and not move, it is likewiſe impoſſible that Chriſt's body ſhould be in divers Hoſts at the ſame time. In like manner, if Chriſt's body were at the ſame time in Heaven, and in the Hoſt it would be eaten and not eaten at the ſame time; for it would be eaten in the Hoſt by the Prieſt, and at the ſame time it would not be eaten in Heaven. Alſo it would be in a point and not in a point at the ſame time; for in the Hoſt it would be in a point, and in Heaven it would not be in a point at the ſame time: Therefore ſeeing it is impoſſible that one and the ſame body at one and the ſame time ſhould

be

be eaten and not eaten, ſhould be in a point and not in a point; it is alſo impoſſible that Chriſt's body ſhould be both in Heaven and in the Hoſt at the ſame time.

8. The fourth Argument is this: Two relatives are always different, as the Father and Son, the Husband and the Wife, *&c.* And relation is always between two things that really differ; as the equality between two Ells, the reſemblance between two Crows, *&c.* In a word, nothing can have relation to it ſelf, but whatſoever hath relation muſt neceſſarily have it to ſomething elſe, as appears by the definition of Relation: But to be diſtant is a relative and not an abſolute term; for when we conceive an abſolute term we conceive but one thing, as when we conceive a Crow; but when we conceive a relative term, we neceſſarily conceive two things. For example, We cannot conceive a Crow to be like, without conceiving ſomething elſe to which it is like. Seeing then we cannot conceive a thing to be diſtant without conceiving ſomething elſe from which it is diſtant, it is evident that to be diſtant is a relative term, and that diſtant things are relatives, and conſequently are really different. Whence I form this Argument: Re-

relative things are really different, as hath been proved: But the body that is at *Rome* is diſtant from that which is at *Paris*, by reaſon of the ſpace of about 300 leagues that is between thoſe two Cities; and the body that is in the higheſt heavens is diſtant from that which is upon earth, by reaſon of the many thouſands of leagues that are between heaven and earth: Therefore the body that is at *Rome* is different from that which is at *Paris*, and that which is in Heaven, is different from that which is upon earth; and conſequently one and the ſame body cannot be at the ſame time at *Rome* and at *Paris*, in Heaven and upon Earth; elſe one and the ſame body might be diſtant and different from it ſelf, which is a contradiction: Therefore ſeeing Jeſus Chriſt is not diſtant, and different from himſelf, it follows that he cannot be at the ſame time in Heaven and in the Hoſt, nor at the ſame tme in the conſecrated Hoſts at *Rome* and at *Paris*.

9. But perhaps it may be ſaid that a body being at the ſame time in two diſtant places is not diſtant from it ſelf, but that the places only are diſtant; and therefore that Chriſt's body in heaven is not diſtant from it ſelf in the Hoſt, but it is the places only, *viz.*

heaven

heaven and earth (where the Hoſt is) that are diſtant. To this I anſwer that it is only the diſtance of places that makes the diſtance of things exiſting in thoſe diſtant places. For example: The reaſon why *Peter* that is at *Rome* is diſtant from *Paul* that is at *Paris*, is not becauſe they are two things really different, elſe they would be always diſtant, even when they are in one Bed together, (for they are always really different) but all the reaſon of their diſtance is, becauſe they are in two diſtant places. Seeing then (according to our Adverſaries) that Chriſt's body is in two diſtant places at once, *viz.* in Heaven and in the Hoſt at *Rome* and at *Paris* in divers Hoſts, it follows that Chriſts body is diſtant, and different from it ſelf. And ſeeing it is impoſſible that it ſhould be diſtant and different from it ſelf, it is evident that it cannot be in two diſtant places at once; and conſequently not in Heaven and in the Hoſt.

10. Beſides, Suppoſe that *Peter* could be at *Rome* and at *Paris* at once, and that *Peter* that is at *Rome* ſhould have a mind to go to *Paris*, and ſhould go accordingly, and that the ſame *Peter* that is at *Paris* ſhould have a mind to go to *Rome*, and ſhould go accordingly, it is certain that *Peter* would draw

near to himſelf, and meet himſelf. But things that draw near to each other, muſt of neceſſity have been at a diſtance before; and therefore if a body draws near to it ſelf, it is certain that it was diſtant from it ſelf before. And hereupon I would fain ask our Adverſaries, whether, when *Peter* ſhould meet himſelf, he would let himſelf paſs, or not? and if he ſhould let himſelf paſs, whether *Peter* going to *Rome*, would ſtep aſide and give way to himſelf going to *Paris*, or elſe the contrary? But if he ſhould not ſtep aſide and give place to himſelf, I would ask, whether he would hinder himſelf from paſſing or not? and if he ſhould not hinder himſelf from paſſing, whether he would paſs thorow himſelf, and ſo make another *Janus* with two faces, *&c?* Whatſoever anſwers they ſhall make to theſe Queſtions muſt (I am ſure) be very abſurd and ridiculous.

11. The fifth Argument is this: It is a perfect contradiction, that a body ſhould be one and not one: But if Chriſt's body ſhould be at the ſame time in the heaven, and upon earth in the Hoſt, it would be one and not one; for it would be one by our Adverſaries own confeſſion, and it would not be one; which I prove thus: That a thing

thing may be one, it must neither be divided in it self, nor from it self, as appears by the definition of Unity; and it is certain that nothing is divided or separated from it self: But if Christ's body be at the same time in heaven and upon earth in the Host, it will be divided, and separated from it self, that which is in heaven being divided and separated from that which is upon earth, because it is not in the space between both.

12. Here again it may be objected, That a body in divers places is divided from it self locally, because the places in which it is, are divided; but not entitatively, because it is still one and the same entity of body. To which I answer, 1. That entitative division (which is nothing else but a plurality of beings, or a plurality of things really different) is no true division, for then the three divine Persons which are really different, would also be really divided; and the body and soul of a living man which do really differ, would also be really divided. 2. I say, That if a body be divided and separated from bodies which it toucheth, it is also divided and separated from bodies which it doth not touch; and if a body be divided and separated from

bodies to which it is near, it is also divided and separated from bodies that are far distant from it; but especially the division is true, when between two there be bodies of divers natures, to which there is no union. Therefore, seeing that between Christ's body, which is really in heaven, and the same body, which is pretendedly upon earth in the consecrated Hosts, there be divers bodies of divers natures, to which it is not united; it is evident by our Adversaries own doctrine, that Christs body is really divided and separated from it self, And seeing it is impossible it should be separated from it self, it is also impossible that it should be in heaven and in the Host at the same time. 3. I say, That local division takes away entitative division, and things that are divided locally, are also divided entitatively; that is, they are also really different; else no reason can be given why two glasses of water taken from the same fountain, are really different, seeing these waters are like in all things, except in reference to place; and there can no reason be given why the Ocean is not one single drop of water only, reproduced in all places occupied by the Ocean, except it be that one drop of wa-

ter

ter cannot be reproduced in all thoſe places; but if it be poſſible, then Reaſon obligeth us to believe that it is really ſo, becauſe God and Nature do nothing in vain; and it is in vain to do that by many things, which may be done by one thing: and if it be really ſo, then it follows, That all the Sea-battels that ever have been, were fought in one drop of water, and many thouſands of men have been drowned in one drop of water, and people ſince *Adam* have drunk but one drop of water, which things are abſur'd and ridiculous.

13. The ſixth Argument is this: Jeſus Chriſt as he is a man, cannot be in divers places at once, if another man cannot be ſo too, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, as he is man, *was made like unto us in all things, ſin only excepted*, as the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* obſerves. But another man cannot be in divers places at once; for example, *Peter* cannot be at the ſame time at *Paris* and at *Rome*, which I prove thus. It is impoſſible that *Peter* ſhould be a man and no man at the ſame time: But if *Peter* could at the ſame time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might at the ſame time be a man and no man, which I prove thus: He that may at the ſame time, be both dead and alive, may at the ſame time be a man and no man; becauſe he that

is

is alive is a real man, and he that is dead is no real man, but a carcaſs: But if *Peter* could at the ſame time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might be both alive and dead at the ſame time; for he might be mortally wounded at *Paris* and die there, and at the ſame time not be hurt at *Rome*, but alive and making merry there. Beſides, *Peter* might be diviſibly at *Paris*, and indiviſibly at *Rome*; (as Chriſt's body, according to our Adverſaries, is diviſibly in heaven, and indiviſibly in the Hoſt:) But if at *Paris* (where he ſhould be diviſibly) his head ſhould be cut off, he would die, and ceaſe to be a man; and at *Rome* (where he ſhould be indiviſibly and in a point) his head ſhould not be cut off, and ſo he ſhould remain at the ſame time a living and real man, which is a contradiction. In a word, *Peter* might be at *Paris* in the midſt of flames, and be burnt and reduced to aſhes, and conſequently ſhould die, and be no man; whereas at the ſame time he might be at *Rome* in the River *Tiber*, ſound and brisk, and conſequently be a true living man: whence it follows that he might be a man, and no man, which is a contradiction.

14. To this may be added other abſurdities that would follow from this Poſition, that

that one body may be in divers places at once, *viz.* That one Candle lighted might give light to all the World, if it were reproduced in all places of the World: That a great Army might be made of one man, reproduced in a hundred thouſand adjoyning places: That all the debts in the World might be paid with one Crown, reproduced as many times as there be Crowns due: That all the people in the World might quench their thirſt with one Pottle of Wine, reproduced as many times as there be inhabitants in the World: That all the men in the World might drink in one and the ſame Glaſs, reproduced as many times as there be men in the World: (whereupon a man might be ſo curious as to ask, whether if this Glaſs ſhould be broken at *Paris*, it would alſo be broken at *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, and other places:) That one man reproduced in an hundred thouſand places, might at the ſame time marry an hundred thouſand wives, and lie with them; whereupon a man might deſire to know whether theſe women might not conceive, and every one of them be delivered of a child at the end of nine months; and conſequently it may be ſaid that one man did in one night beget a hundred thouſand children, *&c.*

15. The

15. The ſeventh Argument is this: If Chriſt's body were in the Hoſt, it would be ſeen there; for being there in its glory (as the *Romiſh* Doctors ſay it is) it would be there more viſibly then it was when he converſed amongſt men here below; becauſe the glory of Chriſt's body doth principally conſiſt in the brightneſs and ſplendor of an extraordinary light, like to that which it had upon Mount *Tabor*; but who dares affirm that ſuch a glorious body is not viſible, whereſoever it is; and yet it is certain that Chriſt's body is not to be ſeen in the Hoſt, which is an evident ſign that it is not there. But it may be ſaid that Chriſt's body is under the accidents of the Bread, and that theſe accidents hide it from us. To this I anſwer, that (according to our Adverſaries) Chriſt's body is in the place where the ſubſtance of the Bread was: But the ſubſtance of the Bread was not under the accidents, and the accidents of the Bread were not upon their ſubſtance, for then the ſubſtance of the Bread and its accidents had been in two different places, above and under being two ſeveral differences of place, and that which is under is not above, &c. Therefore Chriſt's body cannot be under the accidents of the Bread, and conſequently the accidents

cidents do not hide from us. And ſeeing (as our Adverſaries ſay) Chriſt's Body is in every part and point of the Hoſt, it muſt needs be in the ſuperfices, and conſequently cannot be hid or covered by the accidents of the Bread. Here again it may be ſaid that Chriſt's body is glorious, luminous, and viſible of it ſelf, but God hinders us from ſeeing it. To this I anſwer, That if God hinders, it is only becauſe he is pleaſed ſo to do, and conſequently if he were pleaſed not to hinder, he would not do it, but would permit it to be ſeen in the ſame poſture as it is in the Hoſt. Whereupon I would ask our Adverſaries in what poſture it would be ſeen there, whether ſitting, ſtanding, lying, or in any other poſture, or whether it would be in any poſture at all? If it be in no poſture, it muſt be without any external form, becauſe poſture or ſituation abſolutely depends upon external form. But how can a man be ſeen without an external form of a man, and without being in any poſture of a man? and how can Chriſts body be without poſture and without external form; ſeeing (as our Adverſaries ſay) it is whole and entire in the whole Hoſt, and occupies the whole ſpace of a great Hoſt? But if it be ſitting, or ſtanding, or in another poſture, and with the external form of a man,

and

and if (as they ſay) it be whole, and entire in a point of the Hoſt, then it will follow that a man may be ſeen ſitting, or ſtanding in a point; and ſeeing a man that is ſtanding hath his head above and his feet below, it will follow that Jeſus Chriſt will be ſeen in a point of the Hoſt with his head above and his feet below, though in a point there be nothing above or below. To this I add, That if it could be ſeen in the Hoſt it would appear as big as the Hoſt, becauſe it would occupy the whole ſpace of the Hoſt, and it would appear round, becauſe it would be bounded by the ſpace that the Hoſt occupies, which is round. Beſides, if the Hoſt ſhould be divided into two equal parts, it would appear leſs by one half, and in the form of a half Circle, becauſe it would be whole and entire in the half of the Hoſt, and occupy the ſpace of it. It would alſo appear a hundred thouſand times leſs, and in a hundred thouſand ſeveral forms; for, as they ſay, it is whole and entire in a hundred thouſand parts of the Hoſt, and occupies the ſpaces of them. In a word, There was never ſuch a monſtrous thing ſeen in the World, as Chriſt's Body would be, if it were really in the Hoſt in ſuch a manner, as our Adverſaries affirm it to be.

16. The

16. The eighth Argument is this: Either the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt, which is preteded to be in the Hoſt, can act there, or it cannot: if it cannot act, then it follows that it cannot ſee, hear, know, or love, or exerciſe any other function of the ſenſitive or rational Soul: But if the Manhood of Chriſt in the Hoſt knows nothing, nor loves nothing, then it follows that it will not be happy, becauſe happineſs chiefly conſiſts in the knowledge and love of God. Alſo the Manhood of Chriſt in the Hoſt will be different from his Manhood in Heaven; for it will know in Heaven, and at the ſame time know nothing in the Hoſt; it will love in Heaven and love nothing in the Hoſt; it will ſee in heaven, and ſee nothing in the Hoſt. But if Chriſts Manhood can act in the Hoſt as it doth in Heaven, then it will follow that it will open its eyes, and move its feet in a point; becauſe according to our Adverſaries, it is whole and entire in every point of the Hoſt; And ſeeing, as they tell us, God can as eaſily put the whole world into a point, as he doth the whole manhood of Chriſt into a point of the Hoſt it will follow that all parts of the world exiſting in a point may do in it all thoſe actions which they now do in a vaſt ſpace, as the parts of Chriſts manhood exiſting in a point of the Hoſt can do in it

it all thoſe actions which they do in Heaven; and ſo in a leſs ſpace than is occupied by a grain of Corn; the Sun may move from Eaſt to Weſt, the Sea may have its Flouds and Ebbs, and the *Engliſh* may have a Sea-fight with the *Spaniards*. In a word, a Sparrow may eaſily ſwallow all the World, ſeeing the World will not occupy ſo much ſpace as a grain of Corn doth; and yet the World which it ſhall ſwallow, will be as great as it is at preſent; even as Chriſt's Body in the Hoſt, is as big and as tall as it was on the Croſs, as our Adverſaries affirm.

17. The ninth Argument is this: As a body cannot be in a place, except it be produced there, or that it comes, or be brought thither from ſome other place; ſo a body cannot ceaſe to be in a place without being deſtroyed, or going to ſome other place; and conſequently if Chriſt's Body ceaſeth to be in the Hoſt after the Conſumption of the accidents, it muſt neceſſarily either periſh, or go to ſome other place: But Chriſt's Body cannot periſh, for *Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more*, Rom. 6. And Chriſt's Body goes to no other place, for if it ſhould go to any other place, it would go to Heaven: But it cannot go to Heaven, becauſe it is there already, and a man cannot go to a place where he is already:

ready; Therefore Chriſt's Body doth not ceaſe to be in the Hoſt. Whence it follows, that either Chriſt's Body ſtill remains in the Hoſt, and that it is impoſſible that it ſhould be conſumed, or elſe that it never was in the Hoſt: But every one knows by experience that the Hoſts are eaten and conſumed, and that Chriſt's Body cannot be there after the Conſumption of the accidents of the Bread: Therefore it never was in the Hoſt.

18. The tenth Argument is drawn from hence, That the pretended preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Hoſt, deſtroys the nature of Chriſt's Body, thus: The properties of a Species are incommunicable to every other Species. For example: The properties of a Man are incommunicable to a Beaſt; for, ſeeing the properties flow from the Eſſence, or are the very Eſſence it ſelf, it is evident that if the Eſſence of a Species be incommunicable to another Species, then the properties of a Species are alſo incommunicable to another: But the Body and the Spirit are the two Species of ſubſtance; therefore the properties of the Spirit cannot be communicated to the Body, as the properties of the Body cannot be communicated to the ſpirit. But there are two principal properties which diſtinguiſh bodies from

from ſpirits: The firſt is, That ſpirits are ſubſtances that are penetrable amongſt themſelves, that is, may be together in one and the ſame place, but bodies are impenetrable ſubſtances amongſt themſelves, that is, they cannot be together in one and the ſame place. The ſecond is, That bodies are in a place circumſcriptively, that is, all the Body is in all the place, but all the body is not in every part of the place, but the parts of the body are in the parts of the place; but ſpirits are in a place definitively, that is, all the ſpirit is in all the place, and all the ſpirit is in every part of the place; becauſe a ſpirit having no parts, muſt neceſſarily be all whereſoever it is. Whence I form my Argument thus: That doctrine which gives to a body the properties of a ſpirit, changes the body into a ſpirit, and conſequently deſtroys the nature of a body, ſeeing properties cannot be communicated without the eſſence: But the doctrine of the pretended preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Hoſt, gives to a body the properties of a ſpirit, becauſe it affirms that the quantity of Chriſt's Body penetrates the quantity of the Bread, and is in the ſame place with it; that all the parts of Chriſt's body are penetrated amongſt themſelves, and are all in one and the ſame place; and

that

that Chriſt's Body is all in all the Hoſt, and all in every part of the Hoſt: Therefore the doctrine of the *Romiſh* Church touching the pretended preſence of Chriſt's body in the Hoſt, deſtroys the nature of Chriſt's Body.

19. The eleventh Argument is drawn from hence: That Jeſus Chriſt being ſate at God's right hand is in a glorious eſtate: and yet the doctrine of the pretended preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Hoſt, ſubjects him to divers ignominies, *viz.* that his Body goes into peoples bellies, and amongſt their excrement; that it is ſubject to be eaten by his Enemies, yea by Mice and other Beaſts. Hear what *Claude de Xaintes*, a famous *Romiſh* Doctor ſaith of it, *Repet.* 5. *Chap.* 2. *Of all theſe we exclude not one from the true and corporal receiving of the Lords fleſh in the Sacrament, let him be Turk, Atheiſt, Infidel, or Hypocrite; yea, though he ſhould be the Devil himſelf incarnate.* It is alſo ſubject to be ſtoln, for about 25 years ſince a Thief was executed at *Paris* for ſtealing out of a Church the Chalice and this God in it; and the Prieſt went to the Priſon in his ſacerdotal Ornaments, and falling on his knees before the Thiefs pocket, pulled his God out of it. And as it is a God, that cannot keep himſelf from being ſtoln, ſo neither can he keep himſelf

ſelf from being burnt, as it appeared when the *Palace-Hall* at *Paris* was burnt. In ſhort, The Hoſt, or God of the Maſs, hath been ſeen in the hands of one poſſeſſed by the Devil, and conſequently in the Devils power; yea, there are Charms made by the *Romiſh* Prieſts to compel the Devil to reſtore God to them. A horrible and prodigious thing to put God into the Devils power, and into a capacity of being eaten by the Devil incarnate, eſpecially, ſeeing he is now glorious in Heaven.

20. The twelfth Argument is drawn from hence: That God doth no miracles without neceſſity: But what neceſſity is there that he ſhould do ſo many miracles in this Sacrament, *viz.* that accidents ſhould be without a ſubject? that the Bread ſhould be converted into Chriſt's Body, which is already? That Chriſt's Body ſhould be in a point, and a hundred thouſand places at once? What neceſſity is there that it ſhould be eaten by wicked men, by Beaſts, and by Devils incarnate? What neceſſity is there that ſhould it be carried away by the Devil, that it ſhould be ſtoln, burnt, *&c.* Can it be ſaid that it is for the ſalvation of the Soul of him that eats it? But Reprobates, as our Adverſaries confeſs, eat it too; and the Faithful under the Old Teſta-

Teſtament did not eat it, nor do the little children of Believers under the New, and yet they are ſaved for all that. Can it be ſaid with *Bellarmin* and *Perron*, that the Hoſt being eaten, ſerves, as an incorruptible ſeed for a glorious Reſurrection? But the Faithful of the Old Teſtament, and the little children of Believers under the New, will riſe again gloriouſly, though they never participated of the Euchariſt. And St. *Paul* tells us *Rom.* 8. that this ſeed of the reſurrection of our Bodies is not Chriſt's Fleſh, but his Spirit, in theſe words, *If the Spirit of him that raiſed up Jeſus from the dead, dwell in you, he ſhall alſo quicken your mortal Bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*

21. Laſtly, The holy Scripture is clear in this matter; for Jeſus Chriſt is aſcended into Heaven, *Acts* 1. *And the Heavens muſt contain him until the time of reſtitution of all things*, Acts 3. and he himſelf ſaith, *I leave the World and go to the Father*, St. John 16. *The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always*, St. Matth. 26. To which may added what Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, St. *Matth.* 24. viz. *In the laſt days falſe Prophets will come that ſhall ſay, Chriſt is here or there, and that he is in ſecret chambers*, (or Cabinets) which cannot be but by the doctrine of the

Romiſh

Romish Church, which puts Christ's Body in divers places, and shuts it up in several Cabinets on their Altars; and it is very remarkable that in the Greek it is ἐν ταμείοις, that is, in the Cupboards, ταμεῖον being properly a Cupboard to keep meat in.

CHAP. V.

Against the adoration or worshipping of the Host.

1. AGainst the adoration of the Host, I form three Propositions; The first is this, We are not obliged to adore or worship God every where, or in all places where he is, at least not with external adoration, but we are only obliged to worship him in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty. The first part of this Proposition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is, appears by the practice of all Christians. For God being every where, and consequently in Stones, Trees, Beasts, Devils, and all other Creatures, there is no man so extravagant as to fall on his knees before a Tree, an Ass, or a Devil, that he may worship God in them, who is as really present in them, as he is in Heaven.

2. The second part of this Proposition, *viz.* that

that we are only obliged to worship God both with internal and external adoration in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty, is proved, first, by the commands which Jesus Christ gave his Apostles when they asked him how they should pray; for he answers them thus: *When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven*, St. *Matth.* 6. St. *Luke* 11. Why doth he say, *which art in Heaven*, and not, which art on Earth, or in the Sea, or in the Air, seeing God is equally in all these places? But only, because God appears in Heaven in his glorious Majesty, and there crowns all the blessed Spirits with his Glory. Secondly, When God appeared to *Moses* in the burning Bush, which was not consumed, he said to him, *Take thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground*, Exod. 3. Why is this ground called holy, and *Moses* commanded to approach it with reverence, submission, and adoration, seeing any other ground is equally God's Creature, and that he is equally present every where? But only, because God did manifest somewhat of his Power and Glory in that place, by causing the Bush to burn without being consumed. Thirdly, *Joshua and the Israelites did prostrate themselves before the Ark of the Covenant*, Joshua 7. 6.

becauſe God appeared there in a peculiar and glorious manner; for, from the Mercy-ſeat which covered it, he gave his Oracles, and made known his will, *Exod.* 25. 22. *Numb.* 7.

Fourthly, When the Prieſt celebrates Maſs, a little before the conſecration, he recommends the *ſurſùm corda*, that is, the lifting up of their hearts; Why the lifting them up, ſeeing God is equally both above and below? but only becauſe God appears in Heaven in his glorious Majeſty; and conſequently it is thither that we muſt direct our Vows, our Prayers, and our Worſhip.

3. The ſecond Propoſition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt in the water of Baptiſm, though he be really there in regard of all that is adorable in him. The firſt part of this Propoſition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Water of Baptiſm, is chiefly proved by the practice of all Chriſtians; for no man ever fell on his knees before the Water of Baptiſm, and adored Jeſus Chriſt in it, at leaſt not with external Worſhip, which is only here intended; and doubtleſs the reaſon is, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt diſcovers no beam of his Glory there; nor doth he appear in the Water of Baptiſm any more than

in

in other waters ; ſo that as we are not obliged to worſhip God, ſave only where he appears in his glorious Majeſty, as hath been proved ; ſo neither are we obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt, but only where he diſcovers ſome beam of his Glory , which he doth not in the Water of Baptiſm.

4. The ſecond part of this Propoſition, *viz.* That Jeſus Chriſt is really preſent in the Water of Baptiſm in reſpect of all that is to be adored in him, is proved thus : All that is of it ſelf adorable in Jeſus Chriſt, is either his Godhead, or his divine Perſon, or his divine Attributes. As for his Godhead, ſeeing it is really every where it cannot be denied but that it is alſo in the Water of Baptiſm. As for his Perſon, ſeeing it is divine, and eternal , and infinite, it is really every where, and conſequently in the Water of Baptiſm : and as for his divine Attributes, ſeeing they are not really different from the Godhead, or the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, it neceſſarily follows, that ſeeing the Godhead and Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt are really in the Water of Baptiſm, his divine Attributes muſt really be there likewiſe.

5. The third Propoſition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt though he be really there in reſpect of al'

that is to be adored in him, *viz.* in reſpect of his Godhead, his divine Perſon, & his divine Attributes; yea, though he were there inviſibly in reſpect of his Manhood too. The principal reaſon of this hath been toucht upon already, *viz.* That as we are not obliged to worſhip God in all places where he is (at leaſt not with external worſhip) but there only where he appears in his glorious Majeſty, *viz.* ordinarily in Heaven, and extraordinarily elſe where, as hath been proved in the firſt Propoſition. And as we are not obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Water of Baptiſm with external adoration, though he be really there in reſpect of all that is adorable in him, becauſe he doth not diſcover the leaſt beam of his Glory there, nor appears in the Water of Baptiſm more than in other waters, as hath been proved in the ſecond Propoſition: Even ſo we are not obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt with external adoration although he be there in reſpect of all that is to be adored in him, yea, though he were there in reſpect of his Manhood too; becauſe Jeſus Chriſt doth not diſcover any beam of his glory there, nor doth he appear in the conſecrated Hoſts any more than in thoſe that are not conſecrated; for no man can diſtinguiſh the one from the other.

ther. And as for his Manhood which is pretended to be there inviſibly, I ſay that there is no ſenſible mark of its preſence, and conſequently nothing which obligeth us to external worſhip, for the ſame reaſon as is already alledged; for if the inviſible preſence of the Godhead, divine Perſon, and divine Attributes of Jeſus Chriſt which are of themſelves adorable, do not oblige us to external worſhip in the Water of Baptiſm, why ſhould the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt, which is not of it ſelf adorable, oblige us to external adoration though it were in the Hoſt, it being there only, as they ſay, inviſibly? In a word, They muſt ſhew us the diſparity, and tell us the reaſon why we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt with external worſhip in the Water of Baptiſm, though he be really there preſent in reſpect of all that which is adorable in him, *viz.* in reſpect of his Godhead, his divine Perſon, and his divine Attributes, and yet are obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt with an external worſhip, though nothing renders him more adorable there than in the water of Baptiſm.

6. To this the Jeſuite S. *Rigant*, one of the moſt learned of his Order, anſwers,

That although there be nothing in the conſecrated Hoſt that renders him more adorable than in the Water of Baptiſm; yet there is ſomething in the Hoſt which obligeth us to external worſhip, which is not in the Water of Baptiſm; becauſe, ſaith he, the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt is in the Hoſt, and is there in ſtead of a ray of glory; and God will be adored in all places, where the Manhood perſonally united to the Godhead, is preſent: But in the Water of Baptiſm Jeſus Chriſt diſcovers no beam of his glory, and his Manhood, which is equivalent to a ray of glory, is not there,

7. To this I reply, That the rays or beams of glory which oblige us to external adoration in a certain place, muſt be ſenſibly in that place. And therefore ſeeing the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt which is pretended and ſuppoſed to be really preſent in the Hoſt, is neither viſible nor ſenſible, it cannot be equivalent to a beam of glory. To which I add, That as the Godhead and Divine perſon of Jeſus Chriſt which are equally preſent in the Water of Baptiſm, and in the Hoſt, do not oblige us to external worſhip, for this only reaſon, *viz.* becauſe they do not diſcover any ray of their glory there: ſo neither doth the Manhood

of

of Jeſus Chriſt, pretended and ſuppoſed to be really preſent in the Hoſt, oblige us to external adoration, for this only reaſon, *viz.* becauſe it appears not there, nor diſcovers any ray of its glory. Laſtly, I affirm that by the very doctrine and practice of the *Romiſh* Church it ſelf, we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt in all places where his Manhood is, becauſe, as the *Romiſh* Doctors confeſs, we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt in that Hoſt which the Prieſt hath newly eaten, and whoſe accidents are not yet deſtroyed; nor in that Hoſt which is lockt up in the Cupboard that is on the Altar; nor in that hoſt which a Prieſt carries under his Cloak to a ſick perſon in the Country.

8. To this the ſame Jeſuite anſwers, That although the glory of Chriſts Manhood, appears not to our bodily eyes, yet it appears to the eyes of our ſoul, *viz.* to our Faith; for the greateſt glory of Chriſts Manhood conſiſts in its being perſonally united to the Godhead, and in being ſuſtained in a peculiar manner by the Word. Suppoſe then, ſays he, that Jeſus Chriſt be in the Hoſt, we are ſure that it is perſonally united to the Godhead; and conſequently, the glory of Chriſts Manhood, which conſiſts in this

perſonal union, doth certainly appear to our Faith, which is ſufficient to oblige us to an external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt.

9. To this I reply, That there is a two-fold glory of God, and of Jeſus Chriſt, or of his Manhood, *viz.* the one eſſential, internal, and hid from our ſenſes; the other accidental, external and apparent to our ſenſes: the eſſential and internal glory of God which is hid from our ſenſes, conſiſts in the eminence of his perfections, which are to be infinite, almighty, moſt wiſe, *&c.* and the accidental and external glory of God, which appears to our ſenſes, conſiſts in ſome miraculous and extraordinary effect, which is ſenſible; as when God cauſed a Buſh to burn without being conſumed; when he pronounced his Oracles from above the Mercy-ſeat; and when, being made man, and having manifeſted himſelf in the fleſh, he commanded the Winds and the Waves, caſt out Devils, raiſed the dead, *&c.* But I affirm that we are not obliged to worſhip God with an external adoration in all places where he is, in his eſſential and internal glory only, although it appears to our Faith; becauſe God being every where with this eſſential and internal glo-

ry,

ry, we ſhould be obliged to worſhip him with an external adoration in Trees, in Beaſts, yea, and in Devils too, which is abſurd: But we are only obliged to worſhip God with external worſhip in all places where he makes his eſſential and internal glory appear by ſome accidental and external glory, *viz.* by ſome miraculous or extraordinary effect, which is ſenſible, and equivalent to a ray of his eſſential and internal glory, as appears by what is ſaid in the firſt Propoſition. In like manner the perſonal union of the Godhead and Manhood, being an eſſential glory of Jeſus Chriſt, and an internal glory of his Manhood, wholly hid from our ſenſes, doth not oblige us to the external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt, although it certainly appears to our Faith, except it be accompanied with an external and ſenſible glory; for if the eſſential and internal glory of the Godhead and divine perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, which appear equally preſent to our Faith in the Water of Baptiſm, do not oblige us to an external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt, except it be accompanied with an accidental, external and ſenſible glory; why ſhould the internal glory of Chriſt's Manhood, which is infinitely beneath the eſſential and

internal glory of the Godhead, and appears preſent to the Faith of thoſe of the *Romiſh* Church, oblige them to the external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt, if it be ſeparated from all external and ſenſible glory? To this I add, That according to the doctrine and practice of the *Romiſh* Church, we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt with external adoration in all places where the perſonal union of the Manhood with the Word, appears to the Faith of thoſe of that Church; for we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt in that Hoſt which a Prieſt hath newly ſwallowed; nor in that Hoſt which is lockt up; nor in that Hoſt which a Prieſt carries under his Cloak to a ſick perſon in the Country; although the eſſential glory of Jeſus Chriſt, and the internal glory of his Manhood (which this Jeſuite makes to conſiſt in the perſonal union of the Manhood with the Word) appear certain to the Faith of thoſe of the *Romiſh* Church.

10. To this the Jeſuite anſwers, That as if we would obtain any grace from God, conſidered as he really exiſts in a ſtone, we ſhould be obliged to proſtration and external worſhip of the Godhead really preſent in that ſtone: ſo, if we would obtain any grace from Jeſus Chriſt really exiſting in

the

the Hoſt, we are obliged to approach unto it with reverence, and external adoration; and conſequently we are obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt with external adoration whenſoever we would obtain any grace from him as he exiſts in the Hoſt.

11. To this I reply, That as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, as he exiſts in a ſtone, except he diſcovers ſome beam of his glory there, (for it is ſufficient to beg grace of God conſidered as he exiſts in heaven, where he appears in his glorious Majeſty, according to the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *when ye pray, ſay, Our Father which art in heaven*, and according to the command of the Apoſtle, *lift up your hearts*) ſo we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jeſus Chriſt, conſidered as exiſting in the Hoſt, becauſe he diſcovers no ray of his glory there; but it is ſufficient to Beg grace of God or Jeſus Chriſt, conſidered as exiſting in heaven, becauſe he always appears there in his glorious Majeſty. Therefore as we are never obliged to beg grace of God conſidered as exiſting in a ſtone, ſo we are never obliged to adore him there: and as we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jeſus Chriſt, conſi-

dered

dered as exiſting in the Hoſt, ſo we are never obliged to adore him there with external adoration.

12. To this the Jeſuite anſwers, That God hath done many miracles by his Sacrament, and in it; both by puniſhing prophane perſons, and the deſpiſers of it, and alſo by making a little child appear upon the Altar, or fleſh in ſtead of the bread, or blood in ſtead of the wine: all which ought to be acknowledged as ſo many rays of the glory of Chriſt's Manhood, and that they ever oblige us to the external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in the hoſt.

13. To this I reply, That I do not at all doubt but that God hath many times puniſhed prophane perſons, and the contemners of this Sacrament, both ordinarily and extraordinarily; for St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 11. tells us that many of thoſe that did receive this Sacrament unworthily, were ſick, and many ſlept, that is, were dead: and St. *Cyprian* in the Treatiſe of thoſe that fall, obſerves God's judgment againſt wicked and prophane perſons, and the contemners of this Sacrament. But as for thoſe apparitions of Jeſus Chriſt in form of a child, and of fleſh and blood, &c. I look on them as fabulous ſtories invented by Monks

Monks and other ſuperſtitious perſons, above ſeven or eight hundred years after Chriſt, when the Doctrine of the real preſence of Chriſt's Manhood in the Hoſt, began to prevail, and was powerfully oppoſed by Gods People in thoſe days.

14. Secondly, I ſay, That although there had been ſuch apparitions, yet we muſt not infer from thence, either the preſence of Chriſts Manhood, or external adoration; becauſe that is not Chriſts fleſh which ſeems to be ſo; and theſe apparitions may be illuſions of the Devil. The Jeſuit *Vaſquez* in *Diſput.* 193. *chap.* 2. ſpeaks thus. *I anſwer, That which appears is not the fleſh of Chriſt, nor of any other that is really fleſh; but it is only an effigies, or appearance of fleſh; as St.* Thomas *ſaith: and whereas the ſimple are deceived, and do believe that Chriſts fleſh is there in a diviſible and bloody manner, it is no great matter; and this deceit muſt be corrected by the right inſtruction of the Doctors.* *Gabriel Biel*, a famous Doctor of the *Romiſh* Church, *Leſſon* 51. upon the *Canon of the Maſs*, ſaith, *that ſuch apparitions of fleſh and blood may be made by the illuſions of the Devil, to deceive the ſimple, God permitting it to be ſo*; and he gives an example of it, *viz. That in a convent of*

Minor

Minor Friers at Yſennes *in* Thuringia, *a certain perſon like unto an Angel, appeared to a Lay-Frier that was preparing himſelf for the Communion, and thruſt into his mouth a piece of fleſh which as ſoon as he had ſwallowed, he was poſſeſſed, and grievouſly tormented by the Devil.* The Jeſuite *Suarez, Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 55. *Sect.* 3. ſpeaks thus. *Experience tells us that by length of time this fleſh and this blood which appear in the Euchariſt, are changed and corrupted.* But when this happens, ſaith that famous *Romiſh* Doctor *Alexander Hales, Sent.* 4. *Queſt.* 11. *It is a ſign that the apparition which was made in that form, was not made by the power of God, but by the power of the Devil, or by the craft of man.*

15. Thirdly, If it were as true as it is falſe, that Jeſus Chriſt hath appeared ſometimes in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in the form of a little child, or of fleſh and of blood; yet I ſay, that as God, when he appeared to *Moſes* in the Buſh that burned without being conſumed, was to be worſhipped there, for this only reaſon, because he diſcovered a beam of his glory by cauſing the Buſh to burn without being conſumed; but it doth not follow that God muſt be worſhipped in all other Buſhes, though

though he be as really in them as he was in that, for this only reaſon, becauſe he doth not diſcover in them any ray of his glory? ſo, if Jeſus Chriſt hath ſometimes appeared viſibly in the Hoſt (which I do not grant) I think then he ſhould have been worſhipped, becauſe of ſuch a viſible appearance, which is equivalent to a ray of glory; but it follows not that Jeſus Chriſt muſt be adored in other Hoſts, where his Manhood appears not, though it be really there, for this only reaſon, becauſe no ray of his glory appears there.

16. To the three foregoing Propoſitions I add this Argument, which is very conſiderable: In lawful adoration it is requiſite that he that adores, be well aſſured that what he adores is the true God, elſe he may juſtly be reproached, as Jeſus Chriſt reproached the woman of *Samaria*, *Ye worſhip ye know not what.* But the *Romaniſts* can never be aſſured (according to their own maxims) that the Hoſt which they worſhip is the true God; and they have always cauſe to ſuſpect that they worſhip a morſel of Bread inſtead of the Redeemer of the World; becauſe according to their own Doctrine, the real preſence of Chriſts body in the Hoſt depends on lawful

ful conſecration; and lawful conſecration depends on the quality of the Prieſt, and on the pronouncing of the words of conſecration, and on his intention in pronouncing them; for there is no conſecration (as they ſay) when either he that celebrates Maſs is no Prieſt, or doth not pronounce the words that are eſſentially requiſite to conſecration, *viz. this is my body*, &c. or doth not pronounce them with intention to conſecrate; and conſequently in theſe caſes the Hoſt remains meer bread. But it is impoſſible certainly to know theſe three things: For as for the quality of the Prieſt, he muſt have been baptized; and he that baptized him muſt have obſerved the eſſential form of Baptiſm, and have had intention to baptize him: Again he muſt have received Ordination from a true Biſhop; and the Biſhop muſt have obſerved the eſſential form of Ordination, and have had intention to make him a Prieſt; and to make this Biſhop a true Biſhop, he muſt have been baptized in due form, and with the requiſite intention, and muſt have received Ordination in due form, and with the requiſite intention from other Biſhops; and they again, for the making them true Biſhops, muſt alſo have received Baptiſm and

Ordination

Ordination in due form, and with the requiſite intention, from other true Biſhops, and theſe from others, and ſo back to the Apoſtles. But who can be aſſured that from the Apoſtles to a Biſhop, or Prieſt, now adays there hath been no failing, either in the eſſential form of Baptiſm or Ordination, or in the requiſite intention? As for the pronouncing of the words requiſite to conſecration, none but the Prieſt can know whether he hath pronounced them or not, becauſe in the celebration of the Maſs, thoſe words are pronounced ſo ſoftly, that no perſon preſent can hear them. And as for the intention, it is evident that no man but himſelf can know it. Beſides, It is known that ſome Prieſts are Magicians, as *Lewis Goffredi*, and other wicked Prieſts, who do neither conſecrate in due form, nor with the requiſite intention, eſpecially ſuch as believe nothing of what they profeſs; yea, divers Monks and Prieſts that have been converted to our Religion, have aſſured us that for a long time before their converſion they did abhor the Idolatry that was practiſed in the adoration of the hoſt. Judge then if ſuch perſons as theſe had any intention to conſecrate in the celebration of the Maſs.

17. The

17. The *Romiſh* Doctors have ſought all the remedies imaginable to prevent this danger. Pope *Adrian Queſt.* 3. ſpeaks thus: *In the adoration of the Euchariſt there is always a tacite condition,* viz. *if the conſecration be duly made; (as hath been decided at the Council of Conſtance) otherwiſe they could not be excuſed from idolatry, that worſhip the Hoſt when the Prieſt pretends to Celebrate, but Celebrates not; or pretends to Celebrate and is no Prieſt, as it many times happens.* Obſerve theſe words, *it many times happens*, for they ſhew that there is great cauſe of doubting, and that much caution muſt be uſed. For, as if a woman, in her husbands abſence, ſhould ſay to a man that comes to her, and tells her he is her husband, (and ſhe hath probable grounds to ſuſpect him) *If thou art my husband I will receive thee,* and thereupon endeavours to clear it before ſhe admits him to any privacy; this condition frees her promiſe from blame but if ſhe gives her ſelf up to him, before ſhe clears this doubt, ſaying, *I will receive thee if thou art my husband,* this condition doth not free her action from blame, but ſhe will be reputed an adultereſs. Even ſo if a man to whom an Hoſt is propoſed to be adored, and he hath

reaſon

reaſon to doubt whether it ought to be adored, ſhould only ſay, *If thou art Chriſt I will adore thee*, and ſhould not adore it before he be well aſſured of it, this condition would render him blameleſs; but if, notwithſtanding his doubt, he adores it, this condition, *if thou art Chriſt, I adore thee*, doth not exempt him from the crime of Idolatry; for to what purpoſes is the condition, whether it be tacite, or expreſt, *I adore thee if thou art Chriſt*, becauſe he actually adores it, without knowing whether it be ſo or not?

18. To what hath been ſaid, I add, That the Primitive Church never adored the Hoſt nor believed that the body and blood of Chriſt were really and inviſibly in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; for if the Chriſtians of the Primitive Church had believed it, they had furniſhed the Heathens with ſpecious pretences to excuſe the Idolatry of their Image-worſhip, and to retort upon the Chriſtians thoſe very arguments which they had made uſe of againſt them.

19. Firſt, The Heathens did maintain that their Idols were compoſed of two things, *viz.* of a viſible Image and an inviſible Deity dwelling in it. *They bring their*

their gods, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom* in *Theodoret.* in *Atrep. into their baſe images of wood and ſtone, and ſhut them up there as in a priſon. Your gods*, ſaith *Arnobius* Book 6. *dwell in Plaiſter and baked Earth; and, that they may make theſe materials more venerable, they ſuffer themſelves to be ſhut up, and to remain hid and detained in an obſcure priſon.* But might not the Heathens have juſtly replied to the Ancient Chriſtians, if they had believed what the *Romiſh* Doctors do now adays; And do not you believe the very ſame of your Hoſt, that it is compoſed of two things, *viz.* of the viſible ſpecies of bread, and the inviſible body of Chriſt, which is hid under the ſpecies? Doth not your Chriſt dwell in baked dough, and that he may make a peice of bread more venerable, doth he not ſuffer himſelf to be ſhut up, and doth he not remain hid, as in a priſon?

20. Secondly, The Heathens held that conſecration was the means whereby the Deity which they adored, was made preſent in the Image. So *Tertullian* in his *Apolog. chap.* 12. ſaith, *I find nothing to object againſt Images, but that the matter of them is ſuch as our Frying-pans and Kettles are made of, which changeth its deſtiny by conſecration.*

cration. And *Minutius Felix* ſpeaks thus of a Pagan Image, *Behold it is melted, forged, faſhioned, and yet is not God; behold it is guilded, finiſhed, erected, and yet is not God; behold it is adorned, conſecrated, and worſhipped, and then it is God.* And *Arnobius* in Book 6. *Dedication or Conſecration makes them dwell in Images, they refuſe not to dwell in habitations of Earth, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of Dedication, they are incorporated, and joyned to the Images.* But might not the Heathens have replied to the Chriſtians thus; We find it juſt ſo in your Euchariſt, *viz.* that the ſigns are of the ſame matter with our common Bread and Wine, but change their deſtiny by conſecration; behold it is kneaded, and moulded, and yet it is not God; behold it is baked in the Oven, and yet it is not God; behold it is conſecrated and adored, and then it is God; for your Chriſt doth not refuſe to enter into theſe earthly matters, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of conſecration, he is incorporated and joyned to the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine?

21. Thirdly, The Heathens had both great and little Images, and did believe that the Deity, which they worſhipped, was

was as well in the little as in the great ones. *Arnobius* in Book 6. jeers them for this, ſaying, that *If their Gods had their great and little Images in which they dwelt, they muſt needs be ſtraightned for want of room in the little ones, whereas in the great ones they might ſtretch themſelves out at their full length.* But might not the Heathens have reproached the Chriſtians of thoſe times in the ſame manner if they had believed that Jeſus Chriſt had been wholly contained as well in a little Hoſt as in a great one, and as well in the leaſt part of the Hoſt as in the greateſt?

22. Laſtly, The Heathens were reproached for worſhipping Wood and Stone, the work of mens hands; things that cannot ſee, hear, ſmell, taſte, breath, ſpeak, or move; things expoſed to age, ruſt, corruption, duſt, falling, breaking, burning, *&c.* to the injuries of Worms, Mice, and other Beaſts; ſubject to the power of Enemies, to be ſtoln, lockt up, *&c.* as you may read in *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Minutius Felix*, and other ancient Doctors of the Church. But if thoſe ancient Chriſtians had believed what the Romaniſts now do, might not the Heathens have replied thus? And can you deny that the Hoſt which

you

you worſhip is the work of a mans hands, that moulded it, and gave it ſuch a form as pleaſed him, and then conſecrated it with certain words to make your Chriſt come in into it whole and entire? Do not you adore your Hoſt, which neither ſees, nor hears, nor ſmells, nor breaths, nor walks, nor ſpeaks, nor moves? Is not your Hoſt ſubject to age, duſt, falling, burning, to Worms, to Mice, and other Beaſts? Is it not ſubject to be taken away, ſtolen, lockt up? *&c.* But if it be ſaid that the accidents of the Hoſt are only ſubject to theſe inconveniences, and not Jeſus Chriſt that is under them; I anſwer that the Heathens had ſaid the ſame, *viz.* that their Gods were not ſubject to theſe inconveniences, but the Images only in which they were; for in *Arnobius* his 6 Book, they ſpeak thus: *We believe not the Copper, Gold, and Silver, whereof the Images are made, to be Gods and Deities, that of themſelves deſerve adoration; but in theſe materials we adore thoſe that ſacred dedication introduceth, and cauſeth to dwell in the Images.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Against the taking away of the Cup.

1. THe taking away of the Eucharistical Cup was established as an Article of Faith by the *Romish* Church Representative, assembled in Council at *Constance*; *Anno* 1415. *Session* 13. in a Canon, the chief clauses whereof are these: *Seeing that in divers parts of the World there be some who rashly presume to say, that Christian people ought to partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of the Bread and Wine, and do give the Communion to Lay-people, not only under the species of the Bread, but also under the species of the Wine; this present holy general Council of* Constance, *lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, being desirous to provide for the safety of the faithful against this errour, doth therefore declare, decree, and determine, that although Jesus Christ did administer this venerable Sacrament to his Disciples under both the species of Bread and Wine; and although in the Primitive Church the Faithful did receive this Sacrament under both species, yet notwithstanding*

that

that (for the avoiding of certain dangers and ſcandals) this cuſtom, which was introduced with reaſon, ought to be kept, viz. *that Prieſts that ſay Maſs ſhall communicate under both the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine, but that Lay-perſons ſhall communicate under the ſpecies of Bread only: and they that ſhall ſay the contrary, ought to be expelled as Hereticks, and grievouſly puniſhed by the Biſhops, or their Officials*; This Canon was confirmed by the ſucceeding *Romiſh* Councils, and particularly by the Council of *Trent*.

2. Againſt ſo horrible a Canon and ſo ſtrange a Law, it is very difficult to oppoſe any thing; for, if you tell them that this Law is contrary to the Inſtitution and command of Jeſus Chriſt, they freely confeſs it; ſeeing that although Jeſus Chriſt did inſtitute and adminiſter the Euchariſt under both ſpecies, yet they will not have it ſo practiſed. If you tell them that this Law is contrary to the command of St. *Paul*, and practice of the Primitive Church, they ingeniouſly own it; for they openly declare, that although the Faithful in the Primitive Church did receive the Sacrament of the Euchariſt under both ſpecies, yet they that practiſe it thus, ought to be expelled and puniſhed as Hereticks. This is the true way

of ending all Controverſies, and of keeping us from diſputing with them. For example, If we alledge that St. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 4. ſaith, that *they who forbid to marry, and command to abſtain from meats, do teach the doctrines of Devils*; they need only anſwer, That although St. *Paul* doth ſay ſo, yet we muſt not believe it, becauſe the *Romiſh* Church hath determined otherwiſe. Again, If we alledge, That the ſame Apoſtle *Epheſ.* 2. ſaith, that *we are ſaved by grace, through faith; and that not of our ſelves, it is the gift of God; not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt*; they need only anſwer, That although this was written by the Apoſtle, yet we muſt not believe it, becauſe the *Romiſh* Church hath determined, that we are ſaved by works and faith as coming from our ſelves, and from the ſtrength of our own free will, *&c.* And now I leave you to judge whom we ought to follow, whether theſe lying Doctors, or Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles. But that which I find utterly inſupportable is this, *viz.* that they accuſe of raſhneſs, errour, and hereſie, thoſe that by obeying Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and following the practice of the Primitive Church, do affirm that we ought to partake of the Cup as

well as of the Bread. Again, I find it an inſufferable piece of impudence, that they boaſt ſo much of antiquity, and of the conformity of their Creed to that of the primitive Church, and yet can ſo openly renounce both in this chief and principal point of doctrine.

3. Here the *Romiſh* Doctors now adays think to ſhelter themſelves, By telling us it is true that Jeſus Chriſt did inſtitute the Sacrament of the Euchariſt under both the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine: and that the Primitive Church did ſo celebrate it, not by any expreſs command of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but meerly by Eccleſiaſtical policy, which may be changed, as ſeveral occaſions and circumſtances require. And they add, That it is ſufficient to obſerve that which is of the eſſence of the Sacrament, *viz.* to receive the body and blood of Chriſt; but that the Church may change that which is accidental, *viz.* to receive them under both the ſpecies, or under one ſpecies only; for they will have it, that the blood of Chriſt is under the ſpecies of Bread, by concomitance, and that his body is under the ſpecies of the Wine by concomitance; becauſe Jeſus Chriſt being now glorious, his body and blood cannot be ſeparated.

4. To this I reply, Firſt, That there is an expreſs command of Jeſus Chriſt to take the Cup and drink, St. *Matth.* 26. in theſe words, *drink ye all of it.* To this the *Romiſh* Doctors anſwer, That the word *all* is not extended to all men; for then we ſhould ſay that the Euchariſtical Cup ought to be given to *Turks*, *Jews*, and all other *Infidels.* And they add, that the word *all* doth not extend to all thoſe that are of the body of the Church of the Elect, for then the Euchariſtical cup ſhould be given to little children, whom God hath elected to eternal life: But ſay they, the word *all* is extended only to all thoſe, to whom Jeſus Chriſt gave the cup, *viz.* to the Apoſtles, conſidered as they were Paſtors.

5. To this I reply, That although Jeſus Chriſt gave this command to drink of the Euchariſtical cup to his Apoſtles only, yet we muſt know in what quality they received this command: But it was not in the quality of Apoſtles, for then none but Apoſtles could partake of the cup; and there being now no more Apoſtles, it ſhould be quite taken away, and ſo Maſs could be no more celebrated. And it was not in quality of Paſtors, or ſacrificing Prieſts; for Jeſus Chriſt was then the only Sacrificer, as the

Romiſh

Romiſh Doctors ſay, and the Apoſtles did not then exerciſe the Function of ſacrificing Prieſts. Beſides, it belongs to Paſtors, and thoſe that adminiſter the Sacraments, being publick perſons, to give, and to private perſons to receive only: But the Apoſtles in the celebration of the Euchariſt, did only receive of Jeſus Chriſt their Maſter and Paſtor: Therefore they received the command to drink of the cup, as they were Believers. Whence it follows that all the faithful that partake of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, are obliged by the command of Jeſus Chriſt to drink of the cup. So then the *Romiſh* Doctors are miſtaken when they tell us that none but Prieſts that ſacrifice, have a right to drink of the cup, and that thoſe Prieſts that do not ſacrifice, muſt communicate under the ſpecies of the Bread only, for at that time the Apoſtles did not ſacrifice. To this may be added, that if the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *drink ye all of it*, was ſpoken to Paſtors only, becauſe they to whom Chriſt ſpake were Paſtors; then it follows that the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *Take, eat*, was ſpoken to Paſtors only, becauſe they to whom Jeſus Chriſt ſpake were Paſtors; and ſo the people will not be obliged by any command

to communicate under the ſpecies of the bread, and conſequently will be wholly deprived of the Sacrament, which is very abſurd, and contrary to Chriſtian Religion.

6. Secondly, I ſay, That in 1 *Cor.* 1. there is an expreſs command to all the Faithful to drink of the Cup, in theſe words, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup.* In which words the Apoſtle ſpeaks to all Believers, who, no doubt, have cauſe to examine themſelves. And this is apparent, becauſe St. *Paul* directs his Epiſtle (and conſequently theſe words) to all thoſe of the Church of *Corinth*, as well Lay-men as Eccleſiaſtical; for in *chap.* 1. *verſ.* 2. he directs it to *all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* To this I add, That Jeſus Chriſt doth not only ſay, *as often as ye eat this bread*, but alſo, *as often as ye drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lords death till he come*; ſo that we do as much commemorate Chriſts death by partaking of the cup in the Euchariſt, as we do by partaking of the bread. And this is very proper; for ſeeing that not only the body of Chriſt was broken, but alſo his blood ſhed on the Croſs; and that in every propitiation and expiation for ſin, the effuſion

of

of blood was very conſiderable (becauſe it repreſents death better than any thing elſe doth) it is certain that they do not celebrate the memory of Chriſts death as they ought, that do not partake of this part of the Sacrament, whereby only we commemorate the effuſion of Chriſt's blood.

7. Thirdly, I ſay, that in the diſpute about the Euchariſt, our Adverſaries do alledge to us the words of Jeſus Chriſt in *chap.* 6. of St. *John*'s Goſpel, *Except ye drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.* Why then do they deprive the people of life, by taking the cup from them, and hindring them from drinking? And it is not at all to the purpoſe here to alledge concomitance, and to tell us that by taking Chriſt's body under the ſpecies of the bread, we take his blood alſo, becauſe 'tis inſeparable from his body. For, to this I anſwer, Firſt, That to take Chriſts blood in taking the Hoſt, is not to drink it: But Jeſus Chriſt ſaith expreſly, Except a man drink his blood he hath no life in him. Secondly, I ſay, That although in ſome places by the body, ſhould be meant the body and blood too, yet it could not be in thoſe places where a manifeſt diſtinction is made between the body and the blood: But in

the Sacrament of the Euchariſt this diſtinction is very apparent; for Jeſus Chriſt gave firſt the Sacrament and ſign of his body in theſe words, *Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you*; and then ſeparately the Sacrament of his blood, in theſe words, *Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood, which is ſhed for you.* And he not only ſpeaks of them ſeparately, but repreſents them as really ſeparated in his death, for he ſaith, *my body broken for you, and my blood ſhed for you.* In which words there is no place for concomitance; for the body broken by divers wounds doth not contain the blood, and the blood being ſhed, is not contained in the body. Alſo our Adverſaries affirm, that the ſacramental words do operate that which they ſignifie; But by their own confeſſion, they ſignifie the ſeparation of Chriſts body from his blood, as Card. *Perron* acknowledgeth in his reply to the King of *Great Britain, pag,* 1108. in theſe words, *The ſcope of the entireneſs of this Sacrament, is to put us in mind that this body and this blood which we receive, were divided by his death on the Croſs*; whence St. *Paul* ſaith, *as often as weeat this bread, and drink this cup, we ſhew the Lords death till he come.* Thirdly, I ſay, That as he that eats bread

dipt

dipt in wine, hath indeed wine in his mouth, but doth not drink it; ſo he that ſhould eat or ſwallow a conſecrated Hoſt, would not drink Chriſt's blood, though it were in it.

1. Laſtly, I ſay, That ſeeing the Sacraments were inſtituted to aſſure us the more of the truth of God's promiſes, and that all our comfort depends on this perſwaſion, that all Gods promiſes are moſt true; it neceſſarily follows, that as much of the Sacrament as is taken away, ſo much of the certainty of this perſwaſion is diminiſhed. And 'tis no no purpoſe to ſay that one part of the Sacrament doth as much confirm God's promiſes as the whole Sacrament doth; for if it be ſo, then God hath unneceſſarily inſtituted two Sacraments; for it had been enough to have inſtituted Baptiſm only, ſeeing it is ordained to confirm Gods promiſes. But, if for ſuch a confirmation two Sacraments are better than one, and if two pledges, and two ſeals for that purpoſe, are of more conſequence than one alone; then in one Sacrament alſo, two ſigns are of more weight than one alone, for the confirmation of Gods promiſes. And ſeeing it is ſaid St. *Luke* 22. and 1 *Cor.* 11. that the cup is

the New Teſtament, and the new Covenant in the blood of Chriſt, becauſe it is the Sacrament of it, why then are people deprived of it?

9. As for the imaginary dangers and ſcandals which the *Romiſh* Doctors find in peoples partaking of the Cup, I ſay in general, that Jeſus Chriſt (in whom the treaſures of wiſdom are hid, and in whom the fulneſs of the Godhead dwells bodily) foreſaw them as well as they; and yet he inſtituted and adminiſtred the cup, and commanded all to drink of it. And St. *Paul* who was extraordinarily inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, doth (notwithſtanding theſe pretended dangers and ſcandals) command the *Corinthians*, as well Lay-perſons as Eccleſiaſtical, to drink of the cup, as hath been already proved.

10. The firſt inconvenience which our Adverſaries find in peoples partaking of the cup, is that they fear they may dip their mouſtaches in the Chalice, and ſo the blood of Chriſt may remain on ſome hair of the mouſtache; alſo they fear that the ſpecies of the wine, and conſequently Chriſt's blood, may fall to the ground, and being fallen it cannot be gathered up again.

To this I anſwer: Firſt, That Women, Eunuchs, and ſuch young men as have no beards, ought not to be excluded.

Secondly, It is better to be without Mouſtaches, than without the participation of the whole Sacrament.

Thirdly, this inconvenience proceeds only from a falſe ſuppoſition, *viz.* that Chriſts blood is under the ſpecies of the wine; but if the Sacrament of the Euchariſt there be nothing but Bread and Wine in ſubſtance, and any of it ſhould fall to the ground accidentally, and not through any fault of ours, this inconvenience is not great enough to violate the inſtitution and command of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

11. The ſecond inconvenience is, That it is almoſt impoſſible to obſerve this Law where there is a great number of people and but one Prieſt.

To this I anſwer, Firſt, That in places where there is much people, as in Cities, there are divers Prieſts.

Secondly, If one Prieſt be not enough, another muſt be called from ſome neighbouring place.

Thirdly, That which cannot be done in one day, muſt be done in two or three days, rather than the command of Jeſus Chriſt ſhould

ſhould be violated, and the practice of the Primitive Church abandoned.

12. The third inconvenience is, that ſome have a natural antipathy, or averſion to Wine, and conſequently cannot drink of the cup.

To this I anſwer, That becauſe corporal actions do depend on certain natural powers, they are ſuppoſed to be commanded to thoſe that have natural powers proper to exerciſe thoſe actions, and to none elſe. For example, The hearing of Gods Word is not commanded to deaf perſons, but to thoſe that can hear it; but drinking of Wine is a corporal action, and therefore commanded to thoſe only that can drink it. So that if the cup muſt be taken from all Lay-people, becauſe ſome of them have a natural antipathy to Wine; then the preaching of the Goſpel muſt be taken from Chriſtians, becauſe ſome of them are deaf and cannot hear it.

13. The fourth inconvenience is, That there are ſome Countries where no Wine grows, as in *Lapland*, *Norway*, &c.

To this I anſwer; Firſt, That although no Wine grows in thoſe Countries yet ſome may be brought thither.

Secondly, But if none can be brought with-

without being ſpoiled, and its form changed, then it is better to ſubſtitute the ordinary drink of the Country in ſtead of Wine.

Thirdly, But if this common drink of the Country may not be ſubſtituted inſtead of Wine, then they that cannot have Wine, do abſtain from it, becauſe they are forced thereunto; and it is neither impudence nor contempt, to abſtain from a thing commanded by Jeſus Chriſt, when it is not to be had: but to ordain that they that have wine in abundance ſhall abſtain from the cup, is an inſufferable boldneſs, and a moſt unchriſtian contempt of the Sacrament.

CHAP. VII.

Againſt the Maſs.

1. THe Maſs, according to the *Romiſh* Doctors, is a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt propitiatory for the ſins of the living and dead; and ſo it is defined by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſion* 22. Againſt ſuch a Maſs we might alledgeall the Arguments already made uſe of againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and the pretended preſence

ſence of Chriſts body in the Hoſt; for our Adverſaries confeſs that thoſe reaſons which deſtroy Tranſubſtantiation, and the pretended preſence of Chriſt's body in the Hoſt, do alſo deſtroy the Maſs. But in this Chapter we ſhall only uſe ſuch Arguments as are directly againſt the Maſs, and do utterly deſtroy it.

2. The firſt Argument is drawn from this, *viz.* that in the inſtitution and firſt celebration of the Euchariſt, Jeſus Chriſt did not ſacrifice nor offer his body and blood to his Father, as appears by what is mentioned by the three Evangeliſts and the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, in which there is not the leaſt foot-ſtep to be ſeen of a Sacrifice; or oblation of Chriſts body and blood. This *Bellarmine* confeſſeth in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs, chap.* 27. in theſe words, *The oblation which is made after conſecration, belongs to the intireneſs of the Sacrament, but is not of its eſſence; which I prove, becauſe neither our Lord nor his Apoſtles, did make this oblation at the firſt, as we have demonſtrated out of* Gregory. The Jeſuite *Salmeron* in *Tom.* 13. of his Commentaries on the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, makes a Catalogue of unwritten Traditions, in which he puts the Eccleſiaſtical *Hierarchie, the worſhiping of Images, the Maſs, the manner*

ner of ſacrificing, and the tradition that Jeſus Chriſt did offer a ſacrifice in the Bread and Wine. Card. *Baronius* in his Annals on the year 53. freely confeſſeth that the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt is an unwritten Tradition. A ſtrange thing that the Maſs, which is the foundation of the *Romiſh* Church (for the Doctors require nothing of the people, but that they ſhould go to Maſs) cannot be found to have been inſtituted or commanded by Jeſus Chriſt! And the truth is, if Jeſus Chriſt in the celebration of the Euchariſt had offered unto God his Father a ſacrifice of his Body and Blood, propitiatory for the ſins of the living and dead, then there had been no need that he ſhould have been ſacrificed again on the Croſs; becauſe, having already expiated our ſins in the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt, there was no need he ſhould expiate them again on the Croſs. To this I add, that St. *Paul, Epheſ.* 4. 11. mentions the Offices which Jeſus Chriſt left his Church when he aſcended into Heaven, in theſe words, *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors, and Teachers,* but makes no mention at all of the Sacrificers of Chriſts body and blood, nor in 1 *Tim.* nor in the Epiſtle to *Titus*, when he deſcribes the

the duty of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, without making the leaſt mention of this ſacrificing of Chriſts body and blood.

3. The ſecond Argument is drawn from the definition of a Sacrifice, as it is given us by our Adverſaries: Card. *Bellarmin* in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs, chap.* 2. defines it thus: *Sacrifice is an external oblation made to God alone, whereby in acknowledgment of humane infirmity, and the divine Majeſty, the lawful Miniſter conſecrates by a myſtical ceremony & deſtroys ſomething that is ſenſible and permanent.* From theſe laſt words, *viz.* that the lawful Miniſter deſtroys ſomething that is ſenſible, I form two arguments which deſtroy the ſacrifice of the Maſs.

The firſt is this, In every ſacrifice the thing ſacrificed muſt fall under our ſenſes; for our Adverſaries ſay it is a ſenſible thing: But the body and blood of Chriſt, which are pretended to be ſacrificed in the Maſs, under the accidents of the bread and wine, do not fall under our ſenſes, as we find by experience: Therefore the body and blood of Chriſt which are pretended to be under the accidents of the bread and wine, are not the thing ſacrificed.

The ſecond Argument is this: In every true ſacrifice the thing ſacrificed muſt be utterly

utterly deſtroyed; that is, it muſt be ſo changed, that it muſt ceaſe to be what it was before, as *Bellarmin* ſaith in expreſs terms in the place above cited: But in the pretended Sacrifice of the Maſs, Chriſts body and blood are not deſtroyed, for *Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more, Rom.* 6. Therefore in the pretended Sacrifice of the Maſs, the body and blood of Chriſt are not the thing ſacrificed.

4. To theſe two Arguments *Bellarmin* in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs, ch.* 27. and other *Romiſh* Doctors anſwer, that Chriſts body ſimply is not the thing ſacrificed in the Maſs, but it is Chriſts Body, as it is under the ſpecies of the bread; and that it is in reference to the ſpecies of the bread, that Chriſts body is ſenſible and viſible.

Secondly, They anſwer that in the ſacrifice of the Maſs, Chriſts body is deſtroyed in reſpect of its ſacramental being, but not in reſpect of its natural being; for when it is eaten in the ſacrament it ceaſeth to be under the ſpecies of the bread.

5. To theſe anſwers I reply, Firſt, That Chriſts body is not viſible by the ſpecies of the bread, becauſe, as our Adverſaries ſay, that hides it from us, and hinders us from ſeeing it. And although a ſubſtance may be

be viſible and cognizable by its accidents, yet it is never ſo by the accidents of another ſubſtance; and conſequently Jeſus Chriſt may be ſaid to be viſible by his own accidents, but not by the accidents of the bread, which is juſt alike both in the conſecrated and unconſecrated Hoſts; and 'tis a ridiculous ſhift to ſay that Chriſt's body is viſible under the ſpecies of the bread, becauſe that ſpecies is viſible; for as we cannot ſee Wine that is in a Hogſhead, becauſe we ſee the Hogſhead; and we cannot ſee Money that is in a Purſe cloſed, becauſe we ſee the Purſe; ſo neither can we ſee the body under the ſpecies of the bread, becauſe we ſee the ſpecies; for as our adverſaries ſay, that ſpecies hinders us from ſeeing it.

6. Secondly, I ſay, That by the ſacramental being is underſtood, only an accidental being of Jeſus Chriſt (for example his preſence in the Sacrament) or elſe beſides that, is underſtood his ſubſtantial being too. If his ſubſtantial being be alſo underſtood (ſeeing the ſubſtantial being of a thing is nothing elſe but its ſubſtance and nature) then it will follow that if Jeſus Chriſt be deſtroyed in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in reſpect of his ſubſtantial being, he muſt alſo

alſo be deſtroyed in reſpect of his natural being, which is contrary to what the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 6. that *Jeſus Chriſt dyeth no more.* If an accidental being of Jeſus Chriſt be only underſtood (for example, his preſence in the Sacrament) then theſe abſurdities will follow, *viz.*

Firſt, That the Sacrifice of the Maſs will be the Sacrifice of an accident only, and not of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe the preſence of Jeſus Chriſt is not Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, but an accident of him.

Secondly, It will follow that the Sacrifice of the Maſs, and that of the Croſs will not be the ſame ſacrifice in reference to the thing ſacrificed, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, and his preſence are not the ſame thing; Jeſus Chriſt being a ſubſtance, and his preſence an accident, which is contrary to the deciſion of the Council of *Trent*, which hath determined that the Sacrifice of the Maſs, and that of the Croſs, are the ſame in reference to the thing ſacrificed.

Thirdly, It will follow that the thing which is deſtroyed in the Sacrament, is not the ſame with that, which was produced there, becauſe there is only an accident deſtroyed, whereas a ſubſtance was produced by Tranſubſtantiation, it is a ſub-

ſubſtantial converſion, as hath been ſufficiently proved.

Fourthly, It will follow that the ſacrifice of the Maſs will be offered in the Prieſts ſtomach only, becauſe this preſence is not deſtroyed till the Prieſt hath eaten the Hoſt; and conſequently, the ſacrifice of the Maſs will be offered after the Maſs, for this preſence is only deſtroyed by the deſtruction of the accidents;& commonly theſe accidents are not deſtroyed till after Maſs is ſaid.

Fifthly, It will follow that the juſtice of God will ceaſe to be the ſame; for whereas heretofore it could not be ſatisfied but by the death of Chriſt, and by the deſtruction of his natural being; now God is appeaſed,our ſins expiated, and Gods juſtice ſatisfied by the deſtruction of his ſacramental being only; for they will have it, that the ſacrifice of the Maſs is propitiatory for the ſins of the living and the dead.

7. The third Argument is drawn from theſe words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. *Almoſt all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without ſhedding of blood is no remiſſion: It was therefore neceſſary that the paterns of things in the Heavens ſhould be purified with theſe, but the heavenly things themſelves with better ſacrifices than theſe.* From which words I form this

this Argument. There is no propitiation, or remiſſion of ſins without ſhedding of blood, as the Apoſtle ſaith: But in the Maſs there is no ſhedding of blood (for it is called an unbloody ſacrifice:) Therefore in the Maſs there is no propitiation or remiſſion of ſins; and conſequently no propitiatory ſacrifice for ſin. This Argument may be thus confirmed: Under the Old Teſtament there was no propitiation or purification, without ſhedding of blood, and the types of Heavenly things were ſo purified, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb.* 9. Therefore under the New Teſtament alſo there can be no propitiation or purification without ſhedding of blood, and heavenly things being repreſented by the legal types, muſt be purified by a more excellent ſacrifice, *viz.* by the ſhedding of Chriſts blood. And although the Apoſtle uſeth the word *Sacrifices* in the plural number, yet we muſt underſtand the only Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs; becauſe when one thing is oppoſed to many, it is often expreſſed in the plural number; as when Baptiſm, which is but one, is called Baptiſms, *Heb.* 6. 2. But the only ſacrifice of the Croſs of Chriſt in the Text above cited, *Heb.* 9. 23. is oppoſed to the old Sacrifices, which were Types and Figures of the Sacrifice of the Croſs. 8. The

8. The fourth Argument is drawn from the words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. 16. *This is the Covenant which I will make with them after thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I writ them, and their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remiſſion of thoſe is, there is no more offering for ſin.* Whence I form this Argument: Where there is remiſſion of ſins there is no need of an oblation, or a propitiatory Sacrifice for ſin, as the Apoſtle ſaith: But in the Chriſtian Church, by vertue of the New Teſtament, or New Covenant, confirmed by the blood of Chriſt, there is remiſſion of ſins, *Heb.* 10. 16, 17. Therefore in the Chriſtian Church now adays, there is no need of an oblation, or propitiatory Sacrifice, and conſequently no need of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.

9. The fifth Argument is drawn from the words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often, as the High Prieſt entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then muſt he often have ſuffered from the foundation of the World, but now once in the end of the World, hath he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf. And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment, ſo Chriſt was once offered*

to

to bear the ſins of many, and unto them that look for him ſhall he appear the ſecond time without ſin unto Salvation. This is confirmed by the words of the ſame Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. *The Law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with thoſe Sacrifices which they offered year by year, continually make the comers thereunto perfect, for then would they not have ceaſed to be offered, becauſe the worſhipers once purged ſhould have had no more conſcience of ſins. But in thoſe a remembrance is made again of ſins every year; for it is not poſſible that the blood of Bulls and of Goats ſhould take away ſins,* &c. *And every High Prieſt ſtandeth daily miniſtring and offering oftentimes the ſame Sacrifices which can never take away ſins; but this man after he had offered one Sacrifice for ſins, for ever ſate down on the right hand of God. For by one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctified:* which is conformable to what he had ſaid a little before, that *we are ſanctified by the offering of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* From all which I form theſe Arguments.

10. Firſt, The old Sacrifices were reiterated, for the Apoſtle ſaith, that *the High Prieſt entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others:* but the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt

muſt

muſt not be reiterated, for the ſame Apoſtle ſaith that *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often*; and *that he hath once appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*: Therefore the Sacrifice of the Maſs is not the ſacrifice of the Croſs reiterated, or the reiteration of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, as our adverſaries would have it.

11. Secondly the Apoſtle adding, *elſe he ſhould often have ſuffer'd from the foundation of the World*, Makes it appear that Chriſt cannot be offered without ſuffering: For, as he that ſhould ſay, this is not fire elſe it would be hot, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that fire is hot; and as he that ſhould ſay he is no man elſe he would be rational, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that man is rational: ſo when the Apoſtle ſaith, that *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often, otherwiſe he would often have ſuffered*, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that Jeſus Chriſt cannot offer himſelf without ſuffering: But Jeſus Chriſt doth not ſuffer every day in the Maſs: Therefore he is not offered every day in the Maſs by the Miniſtry of Prieſts.

12. Thirdly, Theſe words *from the foundation of the World*, are of great weight, for 'tis as much as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, if the only Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs be not ſufficient to take away ſins which ſhall be

be committed hereafter, it follows that it was not ſufficient to take away ſins which have been committed heretofore from the creation of the World, for it is very unſuitable that the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs ſhould have more vertue before it was offered than ſince: But the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs, had the vertue to take away ſins before it was, *otherwiſe* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *he ſhould often have ſuffered from the foundation of the World:* Therefore it hath alſo vertue to take away ſins committed ſince it was, and conſequently there is no need that it ſhould be reiterated in the Maſs.

13. Fourthly, The Apoſtles compariſon is conſiderable, the ſenſe whereof is this: As men ſuffer Death but once, and after death appear no more till the day of the reſurrection, and day of judgment; ſo Chriſt hath offered himſelf to his Father once for all on the Croſs to take away ſins, and will be no more on Earth until he comes to judge the quick and the dead. This utterly deſtroys the Maſs, in which Jeſus Chriſt is ſaid to be offered and ſacrificed continually by the Miniſtry of Prieſts.

14. Fifthly, Sacrifices that take away ſins, and ſanctifie thoſe that come thereunto, ought not to be reiterated; for the only rea-

ſon which the Apoſtle alledgeth, why the old Sacrifices of the Law were reiterated, is becauſe they could not take away ſins, nor ſanctifie the comers thereunto as appears by the Text above cited: But the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt on the Croſs, takes away ſins and ſanctifies thoſe that come thereunto: Therefore the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt on the Croſs, ought not to be reiterated, and conſequently is not reiterated in the Maſs.

15. If Jeſus Chriſt did offer himſelf a Sacrifice on the Croſs that he might ſanctifie us for ever, and purchaſe eternal redemption for us, then it is evident that the fruit and efficacy of this ſacrifice endures for ever, and that we muſt have recourſe to no other Sacrifice but to that of the Croſs: But Jeſus Chriſt did offer himſelf a Sacrifice on the Croſs that he might ſanctifie us for ever, and purchaſe eternal redemption for us, as appears by the Text aforeſaid: Therefore the efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Croſs endures for ever, and we muſt have recourſe to no other Sacrifice but to that of the Croſs. In a word, either we muſt confeſs that the Sacrifice of the Croſs hath no vertue to take away ſins, and to ſanctifie us for ever, (which is contrary to what the Apoſtle ſaith) or elſe if it hath this vertue

vertue and ſufficiency, then Jeſus Chriſt hath offered one only Sacrifice once for all, and conſequently is not offered daily in the Maſs by the Miniſtry of Prieſts.

16. Laſtly, The Apoſtle almoſt throughout the whole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, ſaith, that Jeſus Chriſt was conſtituted and conſecrated by his Father, High Prieſt for ever; and particularly *chap.*7. he ſaith, That *many were made Prieſts, becauſe they were not ſuffered to continue by reaſon of death; but Jeſus Chriſt becauſe he continueth for ever, hath an unchangeable Prieſthood; and that he is able to ſave them to the uttermoſt that come unto God by him, ſeeing he ever liveth to make interceſſion for them*; and conſequently he hath no need of Vicars, or companions in his Prieſthood.

17. In anſwer to theſe arguments the *Romiſh* Doctors are wont to ſay that the Sacrifice of the Maſs is the ſame with that of the Croſs, in reſpect of the eſſence of the Sacrifice, the ſame thing being offered in both, *viz.* the Body and blood of Chriſt by the ſame Prieſt, *viz.* by Jeſus Chriſt: But it differs in reſpect of the manner of offering; for on the Croſs Jeſus Chriſt offered himſelf bloudily, that is, when he died he ſhed his bloud for mankind; but in the Maſs he offers himſelf unbloudily, that is, without ſhedding

his blood, and without dying: On the Croſs Jeſus Chriſt was deſtroyed in reſpect of his natural being, but in the Maſs he is deſtroyed in reſpect of his ſacramental being. They add, that all the Arguments drawn from the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, reſpect only that bloody oblation which was once offered on the Croſs; but beſides this bloody Sacrifice there is another that is unbloody, which is daily offered in the Maſs. Laſtly, they ſay that the Sacrifice of the Croſs is Primitive and original, but this of the Maſs repreſentative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Croſs, as the Council of *Trent* hath in its 22 *Seſſion.*

18. To theſe diſtinctions I reply, That the Sacrifice of the Maſs doth not differ from that of the Croſs in reſpect of the manner only, (which is but an accidental difference) but it differs in reſpect of eſſence too.

Firſt, Becauſe the natural death of Jeſus Chriſt is of the eſſence of the Sacrifice of the Croſs: But the Sacrifice of the Maſs doth not comprehend the natural death of Jeſus Chriſt; for *Jeſus Chriſt dyeth no more*, Rom. 6. Therefore the Sacrifice of the Maſs doth not comprehend that which is of the eſſence of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, and conſequently differs from it eſſentially, an dnotin reſpect of the manner only. Second-

Secondly, Becauſe the repreſentation of a thing differs eſſentially from the thing repreſented: For example, The King's Picture differs eſſentially from the King. Alſo the memorial of the thing differs eſſentially from the thing whereof it is a memorial: For example, The celebration of the Paſſeover, which was a memorial of the Angels favourable paſſing over the houſes of the *Iſraelites*, differs eſſentially from that paſſing over. And laſtly, the Application of a thing differs eſſentially from it: For example, The application of a Plaiſter, differs eſſentially from the Plaiſter. But according to the determination of the Council of *Trent*, in *Seſſion* 22. The Sacrifice of the Maſs is repreſentative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Croſs: Therefore the Sacrifice of the Maſs differs eſſentially from that of the Croſs.

Thirdly, Becauſe the Sacrifice of the Croſs is of an infinite value, and conſequently ought not to be reiterated; for its value being infinite, it is ſufficient to take away all ſins paſt, preſent, and to come, as *Bellarmine* ſaith, *Book* 1. of the Maſs, *chap.* 4. But the Sacrifice of the Maſs is of a finite price and value, according to the ſame *Bellarmine* and other *Romiſh* Doctors; at which we may juſtly wonder, ſeeing, as our Adverſaries

ſay, it differs not from the Sacrifice of the Croſs, either in reſpect of the thing Sacrificed, or in reſpect of the chief Prieſt, and yet from theſe the Sacrifice hath all its price and value.

19. Secondly, I ſay, that an unbloody propitiatory Sacrifice is a feigned, and an imaginary thing, and that the Arguments drawn from the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, do wholly deſtroy it.

Firſt, Becauſe it is ſaid, *Heb.* 9. *that without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion of ſins*: therfore in the unbloody Sacrifice of the Maſs, there can be no remiſſion of ſins, and conſequently it cannot be a propitiatory Sacrifice for ſin.

Secondly, Becauſe Jeſus Chriſt cannot be offered without ſuffering; for the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb.* 6. *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often, otherwiſe he ſhould often have ſuffered*: But the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt with ſuffering is a bloody Sacrifice; Therefore there is no unbloody Sacrifice.

Thirdly, Becauſe the bloody Sacrifice of the Croſs, being of an infinite value, hath purchaſed an eternal Redemption, *Heb.* 9. and hath taken away all ſins, paſt, preſent, and to come. Whence it follows that there is no other Sacrifice, either bloody or unbloo-

dy,

dy, that can purchaſe the pardon of our ſins, the Sacrifice of the Croſs having ſufficiently done it.

Fourthly, Becauſe the juſtice of God requires that ſins ſhall be expiated by the puniſhment that is due to them; and this is ſo true that the wrath of God could not be appeaſed but by the bloud and ignominious death of the Croſs: Therefore the juſtice of God muſt have changed its nature, if ſins can be expiated in the Maſs without pain, or ſuffering.

20. Thirdly, To the diſtinction of Primitive Sacrifice, which was offered on the Croſs, and repreſentative, commemorative, and applicative, which is daily offered in the Maſs, I reply, Firſt, That what the Council of *Trent* ſaith in *Seſſion* 22. *viz.* that in the Euchariſt there is a Sacrifice repreſentative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Croſs, may bear a good ſenſe, *viz.* that there is in it a repreſentation, commemoration, and application of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, *viz.* a repreſentation, becauſe the bread broken, repreſents the body broken; and the wine poured into the cup, repreſents the bloud of Chriſt ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins: a commemoration, becauſe all that is done in it, is done in remembrance of Jeſus Chriſt

and his death according to his own command in theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me,* and according to what St. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 11. *As often as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lords death till he come* : & an application becauſe the merit of the Sacrifice of the Croſs is applied to us not only by the word, but alſo by the Sacraments, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter. But our Adverſaries are not content with this, for they will have it that in the celebration of the Euchariſt, there is offered a true and proper Sacrifice propitiatory for the ſins of the living and the dead, which hath been already refuted at large.

Secondly, I ſay that the application of the Sacrifice of the Croſs may be conſidered on God's part, or on Man's part : on God's part, when he offers Jeſus Chriſt to us, with all his benefits, both in his Word and Sacraments : on Man's part, when by a true and lively faith, working by love, we embrace Jeſus Chriſt with all his benefits offered to us both in his Word and Sacraments. And this is that Jeſus Chriſt teacheth us, St. *John* 3. in theſe words, *As Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of man be lifted up,* (viz. on the Croſs) *that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh,*

periſh, but have eternal Life: For God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, (viz. to die) *that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life:* he doth not ſay whoſoever ſacrificeth him in the Maſs, but whoſoever believeth, *&c.* And St. *Paul* ſhews it clearly in theſe words, *God hath ſet forth Jeſus Chriſt to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood*; he doth not ſay through the Sacrifice of the Maſs, but through Faith. And we really and truly apply the Sacrifice of Chriſts Croſs when we have recourſe to him, as a man applies a Plaiſter when he hath recourſe to it, and lays it on the wound; But the recourſe or refuge of a penitent ſinner to the ſacrifice of the Croſs for obtaining mercy from God, is nothing elſe but Faith. As for the diſtinction of the ſacramental and natural being of Jeſus Chriſt, it hath been already refuted in the 6. Number.

21. I ſhall conclude this diſcourſe with the teſtimony of *Thomas Aquinas*, the moſt famous of all the *Romiſh* Doctors, and called by our Adverſaries, the Angelical Doctor. This *Thomas* in *Part.* 3. *Queſt.* 83. *Artic.* 1. having propoſed this Queſtion, *viz.* Whether Chriſt be ſacrificed in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, he concludes with theſe me-

morable words, *The celebration of this Sacrament is very fitly called a ſacrificing of Chriſt, as well becauſe it is the repreſentation of Chriſt's Paſſion, as becauſe by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lords paſſion.* And afterwards he gives his anſwer, in theſe words: *I anſwer, we muſt ſay that the celebration of this Sacrament is called a ſacrificing of Chriſt, in two reſpects. Firſt, becauſe (as* Auguſtine *to* Simplicius *ſaith) we are wont to give to Images, the name of the things whereof they are Images, as when we ſee Pictures on a Wall, or in a Frame, we ſay this is* Cicero, *that is* Saluſt, *&c. But the celebration of this Sacrament (as hath been ſaid above) is a repreſentative Image of Chriſt's Paſſion; which Paſſion is the true ſacrificing of Chriſt, and ſo the celebration of this Sacrament is the ſacrificing of Chriſt. Secondly, the celebration of this Sacrament is called the ſacrificing of Chriſt in regard of the effect of Chriſt's Paſſion, becauſe by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lord's Paſſion.* Let the *Romaniſts* keep to this deciſion of their Angelical Doctor, and we ſhall agree with them in this point; for I am confident that there is not one of the Reformed Religion but will ſubſcribe this true doctrine of *Thomas Aquinas.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing Anſwers to the objections of the Romiſh *Doctors.*

1. IN the two firſt Chapters we have anſwered the two principal Objections of the *Romiſh* Doctors, drawn from theſe words, *This is my body*, &c. and from theſe, *he that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life*, &c. Now we muſt anſwer the reſt.

Objection. 1.

2. The firſt Objection is this. When the eſtabliſhing of Articles of Faith, the inſtitution of Sacraments, and the making Teſtaments and Covenants are in agitation, men ſpeak plainly and properly, and not obſcurely or figuratively; But in the celebration of the Euchariſt Jeſus Chriſt eſtabliſhed an Article of Faith, inſtituted the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and ſpake of a Teſtament and a Covenant: for it is ſaid of the Cup that it is the New Teſtament and the New Covenant in the blood of Chriſt; yea, he ſpake then

then to his Diſciples, to whom he ſpake in plain and proper terms, and not in obſcure terms, or in figures or parables, as he did to the people.

Anſwer.

3. To this Objection I anſwer, Firſt, That it is falſe that Articles of Faith are always expreſſed in proper terms in holy Scripture, as when it is ſaid in the Creed, that *Jeſus Chriſt ſitteth on the right hand of God*, it is evident that this is a Figure and metaphor, for God being a Spirit, hath neither right hand nor left; and all interpreters expound this ſitting on Gods right hand, metaphorically, *viz.* for that Lordſhip both of Heaven and Earth, which he hath received from God his Father, as earthly Princes make their Lieutenants, whom they appoint to govern in their name, to ſit on the right ſide of them. Again when it is ſaid, St. *Matth.* 16. *Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it, & I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven,* &c. It is manifeſt that theſe are Figures and Metaphors, as *Bellarmin* confeſ-

ſeth

ſeth in *Book* 1. Of the Biſhop of *Rome*, *chap.* 10. and yet it is chiefly by this paſſage that they endeavour to prove the Popes authority.

4. Secondly, I anſwer, That the holy Scripture commonly ſpeaks of Sacraments in figurative terms; thus Circumciſion is called God's Covenant, *Gen.* 17. in theſe words, *This is my Covenant, every male ſhall be circumciſed*, that is, this is the ſign of the Covenant, as appears by the following verſe, *Ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreskin, and it ſhall be a token of the Covenant between me and you.* So the Paſchal Lamb is called the Lords Paſſeover, *Exod.* 12. becauſe the bloud of this Lamb ſprinkled on the dore-Poſts, was given as a ſign of the Angels favourable paſſing over the houſes of the *Iſraelites*; as appears by *verſe* 13. of the ſame Chapter. So Baptiſm is called *the waſhing of Regeneration*, becauſe it is the Sacrament of it. In a word, the Euchariſtical cup is called the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the Sign, Seal, and Sacrament of it.

5. Thirdly, I anſwer, that in holy Scripture, Teſtaments are not always expreſſed in proper terms without a Figure; for the Teſtament of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 49. and that of *Moſes*,

Moſes, Deut. 33. are nothing elſe but a chain of Metaphors, and other Figures. And Civilians will have it, that in Teſtaments we ſhould not regard the proper ſignification of the words, but the intention of the Teſtator. To this I add that Jeſus Chriſt did not then make the New Teſtament, and the New Covenant, but only inſtituted the Seal and Sacrament of them: For the Covenant was made with all mankind in the perſon of *Adam* after the Fall, when God promiſed him that the ſeed of the Woman ſhould break the Serpents head. This was afterward renewed with *Abraham* when God promiſed him that in his Seed all the Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, *viz.* in Chriſt, the bleſſed Seed, who hath deſtroyed the Kingdom of Satan. After this it was confirmed by the bloud of Chriſt ſhed on the Croſs: Then it was publiſhed through all the World when the Apoſtles had received the Holy Ghoſt. And laſtly, Baptiſm and the Euchariſt are the Signs, Seals, and Sacraments of it.

6. Fourthly, I anſwer, That if by theſe words, *To ſpeak clearly or plainly*, be underſtood, to ſpeak intelligibly, ſo that the Apoſtles might and ought to underſtand what he ſaid to them, then it is certain that Jeſus Chriſt

Chriſt did ſpeak clearly; for to ſpeak Sacramentally, and according to the ſtile uſed in all Sacraments, was to ſpeak clearly and not obſcurely: But if by theſe words, *to ſpeak clearly*, be underſtood to ſpeak without a figure, then it is falſe that he always ſpeakes clearly to his Diſciples, witneſs the calling of his Diſciples; to whom he ſaid, St. *Mat.* 5. *follow me, and I will make you fiſhers of men:* And when he ſaith elſewhere, *ye are the ſalt of the Earth, the light of the World*, &c. To this I add, The Apoſtles did ask Jeſus Chriſt the meaning of parables and other things which they did not underſtand, and therefore certainly they had much more reaſon to ask the meaning of ſo many ſtrange things as follow from the Maſs, from Tranſubſtantiation, and from the pretended preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Hoſt, *viz.* how a humane body can be in a point, and in divers place at once? How the head of Jeſus Chriſt and his whole body could be in his mouth? How accidents can be without a Subject? *&c.*

7. Laſtly, Seeing Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *drink ye all of this cup*, all Prieſts, whether Jeſuites, Monks, or other *Romiſh* Doctors, would of neceſſity be conſtrained, really, properly, and without a figure, to drink of the cup,

cup, whether melted or not, and really to ſwallow it, until they ſhould confeſs that there are figures in the words of Jeſus Chriſt in the celebration of the Euchariſt.

Objection 2.

8. The ſecond Objection is this: The Sacrament of the Euchariſt is more excellent than that of the Paſſeover, becauſe the Sacrament of the Paſſeover is a Type of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and the thing typified is always more excellent than the Type: But if the Sacrament of the Euchariſt did not really contain the Body and Blood of Chriſt, but was only the ſign of it, then it would follow that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt would not be more excellent than that of the Paſſeover; nay the Sacrament of the Paſſeover would be more excellent than that of the Euchariſt; becauſe a Lamb and its blood is more excellent than Bread and Wine; and the death of a Lamb and the ſhedding of its blood doth much better repreſent the death of Chriſt, and the ſhedding of his blood on the Croſs, than Bread broken, and Wine poured into a cup can do.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

9. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That the thing typified by the Paſchal Lamb, is Jeſus Chriſt, and not the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; as St. *Paul* ſhews clearly, 1 *Cor.* 5. when he calls Jeſus Chriſt our Paſſeover, in theſe words, *Chriſt our Paſſeover was crucified for us.* The truth is, a whole Lamb without ſpot or blemiſh killed and burnt toward the evening, and its blood ſhed, doth very well repreſent Jeſus Chriſt perfect, without ſin, put to death, and his blood ſhed toward the end of the World, and in the fulneſs of time; but ſuch a Lamb repreſents nothing of that which is ſeen in the Euchariſt. Beſides, the Types and Sacraments of the old Teſtament were inſtituted that the Faithful of thoſe times might come to the knowledge of the things typified and ſignified, for the Salvation of their ſouls: But the Faithful under the old Teſtament never came to the knowledge of the Euchariſt by the Paſchal Lamb; and though they had come to the knowledgeof it, yet the had no benefit thereby. In a word, ſeeing

ſeeing the Paſſeover, and the Euchariſt are Types, Images, and Signs of Jeſus Chriſt, 'tis very impertinent to ſay, that the Paſſeover is the Type of the Euchariſt, becauſe a Type is not properly the Type of another Type, but only of the thing typified; as the Image of *Cæſar* is not the Image of another image of *Cæſar*, but only of *Cæſar* himſelf.

10. Secondly, I anſwer, that the excellence of one Sacrament above another, muſt be drawn from its form and efficacy, and not from its matter, becauſe it is form that chiefly gives being to things compoſed of matter and form. But the form of Sacraments depends on the words of Inſtitution; becauſe being Signs of divine Inſtitution, their form can only depend upon the will of God, who chooſeth certain things to ſignifie other things; and this will of God cannot be known but by revelation, which is the Word; ſo that it is properly ſaid, that the word joyned with the Element makes the Sacrament: Therefore although the Sacrament of the Paſſeover be more excellent than the Euchariſt in reſpect of its matter, becauſe the Paſchal Lamb and its blood, are more excellent than the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt; and that the

the Lamb and its bloud have a greater analogy with Jeſus Chriſt and his blood ſhed on the Croſs, than the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt have; yet the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is much more excellent than that of the Paſſeover in reſpect of its form, which depends on the words of Inſtitution, becauſe that at the Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Paſſeover, God ſpake not one word of the principal end for which he did inſtitute it, *viz.* to be the Type of Jeſus Chriſt and his death: But at the Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, Chriſt declared in expreſs terms, that he did inſtitute the eating of the Bread broken, and the drinking of the Wine poured into the cup, to be commemorative ſigns of himſelf, and his death. The Sacrament of the Euchariſt is yet more excellent than that of the Paſſeover, in reſpect of its efficacy, which depends on two things, *viz.* on the form, which being more manifeſt in the Euchariſt, doth alſo operate with more efficacy, and alſo becauſe it repreſents a thing paſt, *viz.* the death of Chriſt: But the knowledge of things paſt is more clear and perfect than the knowledge of things to come; and we are more toucht with the memory of things paſt, when ſome ſymbol brings them to our thoughts

thoughts, than when we conſider things to come, through clouds and ſhadows. To this I add, that the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt have a greater Analogie with Jeſus Chriſt than the Paſchal Lamb had, in one reſpect, *viz.* in regard of the ſpiritual nouriſhment which we receive by Chriſt's death; for as Baptiſm is the Sacrament of our ſpiritual birth, ſo the Euchariſt is the Sacrament of our ſpiritual nouriſhment. But this nouriſhment is much better repreſented by Bread and Wine, which are the ordinary nouriſhment of our bodies; than by a Lamb.

Laſtly, I anſwer, that it is far leſs inconvenient to give ſome prerogative to the Paſſeover above the Euchariſt, (*viz.* to give it a more excellent matter and Analogie) than to aſſert the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Hoſt, by an unheard of Tranſubſtantiation, which deſtroys the nature of Sacraments, gives our Lord a monſtrous Body, includes notorious abſurdities and contradictions, and gives the lye to Senſe, Reaſon, and holy Scripture; as hath been proved.

Objection

Objection 3.

11. Thethird Objection was propoſed at *Niſmes*, *Anno* 1657.by the Jeſuite S. *Rigaut*, thus. God doth communicate, or can communicate to the creature in a finite degree that which he poſſeſſeth in an infinite degree. For example ; God hath an infinite power,whereby he can do all things at once ; therefore he communicates, or can communicate to the creature a finite and limited power, whereby it may do divers things at once as appears in a man,for he can ſee,hear, talk, and walk at the ſame time. God hath alſo an in finite wiſdom and knowledge whereby he knows all things at once; therefore he communicates or can communicate to the creature a finite knowledg, whereby it may know divers things at once. And even ſo God hath a virtual infinite extent, which is called immenſity, whereby he fills all things and all places at once : Therefore God communicates or can communicate to the creature, *viz.* to a body, a finite extent whereby it may fill divers ſpaces, and occupy ſeveral places at once. Whence it follows that Chriſt's Body may be in divers places at the ſame time,*viz.* in Heaven and in the Hoſt.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

12. To this I anſwer, That as God cannot be in two places (for example in Heaven and upon Earth) without being in all thoſe places that are between both, (for then he would be diſtant, and ſeparated from himſelf) ſo Chriſt's Body cannot be in two diſtant places, *viz.* at *Paris* and at *Rome*, in Heaven and upon earth in the Hoſt without being in all thoſe places that are between both; for then it would be diſtant and ſeparated from itſelf, which is impoſſible, as hath been ſufficiently proved. Therefore ſeeing Chriſt's Body is not in all places between *Paris* and *Rome*, and between Heaven and Earth, it follows that it is not in Heaven and upon earth in the Hoſt, nor at *Paris* and *Rome* in conſecrated Hoſts. So that to make a Creature, for example the Body of Chriſt, partaker of God's extent or immenſity, it is ſufficient that as God by his infinite extent occupies all places, ſo Chriſt's Body ſhould by its infinite extent occupy ſome place. But if to make it partake in a finite degree of this

this divine attribute of immenſity, it muſt be in divers places, yet it is ſufficient that it be in divers places ſucceſſively and not at once; or if to make it partake of this attribute it muſt be in divers places at once; yet it is ſufficient that it occupies them by its ſeveral parts; for example, that the head be in one place, and the feet in another, *&c.* In a word, that it be without diſcontinuance or ſeparation, as God is every where without diſcontinuance. Thus the learned, Maſter *Bruguier* then anſwered, and much better, but I cannot remember his full and compleat anſwer.

Objection 4.

13. The fourth objection is this. If divers bodies may miraculouſly be in one and the ſame place, then it alſo follows, that one body may miraculouſly be in divers places, there being no more difficulty or impoſſibility in the one than in the other: But divers bodies may miraculouſly be in one and the ſame place; for Jeſus Chriſt came into the room where his Diſciples were, the dores being ſhut, which he could not

not have done, if his body had not penetrated the dores. Beſides, It is ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and conſequently *Mary* was a Virgin both before and after his Birth, which could not have been if Jeſus Chriſt had not penetrated her belly and come forth without fraction or overture. Laſtly, Jeſus Chriſt penetrated the ſtone that was laid on his Sepulchre when he roſe again; and it is ſaid that he penetrated the Heavens when he aſcended.

Anſwer.

14. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That it is not ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt came in, the dores being ſhut; for theſe are the words, *The ſame day when it was evening, and the dores having been ſhut for fear of the Jews, Jeſus came*, &c. which words do indeed ſhew the time when Jeſus came in unto his Diſciples, but not the manner of his entry by penetration; but if the words be tranſlated, *the dores being ſhut*, and that they do import that the dores were not opened by any body, yet they do not exclude the opening

ing of them in the twinckling of an eye by the divine power, sith we have examples of this in holy Scripture; for *Acts* 5. we read that the Apostles went out of Prison, though the doors had been fast shut; but it is said, that *the Angel of God opened them.* And *Acts* 12. *The door of the prison opened to S. Peter of its own accord*; that is without being opened by any body. And so it is said that Jesus Christ entred, *the doors being shut, or having been shut*; which excludes the opening of them by any body, but not the opening of them by a divine power in so short a time that it was undiscernable.

Secondly I answer, That the Virgin *Mary* was a true Virgin both before and after her delivery, if by being a Virgin be meant not to have had the company of a man; but it is certain that Jesus Christ came out of the Virgins belly by opening her womb; for it is said, S. *Luke* 2. that *Joseph and Mary carried Jesus to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the Law every male that openeth the womb, shall be holy unto the Lord.*

Thirdly I answer, that Jesus Christ did not penetrate the stone that was laid on his Sepulchre; for it is said, S. *Matt.* 28.

That *the Angel of God rolled it back from the door of the Sepulchre.*

Fourthly I answer, That when it is said, *Heb.* 4. that Jesus Christ penetrated the Heavens, we must understand it improperly, in the same manner as it is commonly said that an Arrow penetrates the Air; that is, the Air gives way to the Arrow that passeth through the Air; and so Jesus Christ penetrated the Heavens, because the Heavens gave way to his Body, and not that the Heavens and his Body were in one and the same place.

15. All the *Romish* Doctors agree with us, that modal accidents (which are nothing else but the manners of the being of substances, as Action, Passion, Relation, Figure, *&c.*) cannot be without a subject, no not by the power of God himself. But all the Objections by which they endeavour to prove that the accidents of the Bread and Wine may exist without a subject, (that is, without their substance) do prove the same thing of modal accidents too. So that I shall not stay now to repeat those Objections with their answers, which are set down at large in my dispute about the Eucharist.

Objection 5.

16. The fifth Objection is drawn from *Mal.* 1. in theſe words, *From the riſing of the Sun unto the going down of the ſame, my name ſhall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place ſhall they offer inceníe to my name, and a new and pure offering:* where by this new and pure offering, nothing can be underſtood but the Sacrifice of the Maſs; becauſe by this offering we cannot underſtand Prayers, Alms, Contrition of heart, and other good works, which are ſometimes in Scripture called Oblations and Sacrifices: For the Prophet *Malachi* promiſeth a new offering; But Prayers, Alms, and other good works were common amongſt the Jews; and beſides, they of the Reformed Church do believe that all the actions of the faithful are polluted, and the Prophet ſpeaks of a pure and clean offering. Again, By this offering which *Malachi* ſpeaks of, cannot be underſtood Lambs, Bulls, and ſuch like Animals, which were wont to be ſacrificed in *Solomon*'s Temple; becauſe

the Prophet promiſeth that it ſhall be offered in every place, even amongſt the Heathen. Laſtly, By this offering cannot be underſtood the bloody Sacrifice which Jeſus Chriſt offered on the Croſs, becauſe that bloody Sacrifice was offered but once upon mount *Calvary* in *Judæa*, and the Prophet ſpeaks of an oblation that ſhall be offered in every place: Therefore by this offering muſt be underſtood the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, under the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine, which is nothing elſe but the Maſs.

Anſwer.

17. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That by the offering whereof *Malachi* ſpeaks, muſt be underſtood that ſpiritual Worſhip and Service which Believers ſhould perform unto God under the New Teſtament, which is compriſed in that Sacrifice which they offer to God both of their perſons and religious actions; and this is the reaſon why St. *Paul*, Rom. 12. ſpeaks thus. *I beſeech you therefore Brethren, by*

the

the mercies of God that ye present your bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And *chap.* 15. speaking of the grace that was given him of God, he saith, *it is given him that he should be Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministring the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.* Whence it appears, that by this oblation whereof *Malachi* speaks, we must not understand the offering of Christ's body and blood under the accidents of Bread and Wine, but the offering up of the persons and religious actions of those that should be brought unto God by the preaching of the Gospel, and particularly the Gentiles.

18. Secondly I answer, That in the whole passage of *Malachi* above cited, the words *new offering* are not to be found, but only *clean offering*. And though a new offering had been there spoken of, yet I say that things may be said to be new, when being spoiled and corrupted, they are restored and made sound again. But the service of God which had been corrupted under the Law, was re-established by Jesus Christ and his Apostles

under the Gospel, so that all things were made new; a new Time, *viz.* the time of the preaching of the Gospel; a new People, *viz.* the Christian People; a new place, *viz.* all parts of the World, and not at *Jerusalem* only; a new Prayer, *viz.* the Lord's Prayer; new Sacraments, *viz.* Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and new Preaching, *viz.* the preaching of salvation by Jesus Christ.

19. Thirdly I answer, that the oblation which is offered unto God under the Gospel, is pure and clean; the service which is performed to him, according to his Word, is pure; the preaching of the Gospel is pure. In a word, the Christian Religion is pure, though there be many failings in those that profess it: And although the Faithful that present their bodies a living Sacrifice, Holy, acceptable to God, be compassed about with many infirmities, and that their Religious actions be accompanied with divers failings, yet their persons and works may be said to be pure and clean in Jesus Christ, in whose name they are presented to God; so that although they cannot of themselves please or satisfy God, yet as they are Members of Christ they are reputed holy before

God; For it is theſe St. *Peter* ſpeaks of in *Epiſt.* 1. *chap.* 2. *who, as living ſtones, are built up a ſpiritual houſe, a holy Prieſthood, to offer up ſpiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jeſus Chriſt.* And ſo our Sacrifices are a pure and clean offering, but it is through Jeſus Chriſt, who covers them with his purity and holineſs, ſo that the defects of them are not imputed to us. To this I add, That beſides the perfect purity which we have by the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, we have alſo a purity begun by the Holy Ghoſt; of which St *Paul* ſpeaks, *Rom.* 15. in theſe words, that *the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt*: for that which God hath decreed, Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed, and the Holy Ghoſt hath begun, is reputed by God perfect and compleat. And St. *Paul* ſhews clearly the truth of what hath been ſaid. 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. in theſe words, *I will that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.* And *Epheſ.* 5. *Jeſus Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might Sanctifie and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water by the Word, that he might preſent it to himſelf, a glorious Church, not having ſpot*

or wrinckle, or any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy and without blemiſh.

Objection 6.

20. The ſixth Objection is drawn from *Gen.* 14. in theſe words: *And Melchiſedec King of* Salem, *bringing forth Bread and Wine (for he was a Prieſt) bleſſed him.* And from *Pſal.* 110, and from *Heb.* 7. where it is ſaid, *Thou art a Prieſt for ever after the order of* Melchiſedec. From which words our Adverſaries argue thus. Firſt, They ſay that Jeſus Chriſt is a Prieſt, not after the Order of *Aaron*, but after the order of *Melchiſedec*; the difference between *Aaron* and *Melchiſedec* conſiſting in this, *viz.* that *Aaron* and the other Levitical Prieſts offered bloody Sacrifices, killing and ſhedding the blood of Beaſts, which they Sacrificed to God, as a Sign and Figure of the bloody Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt on the Croſs. But *Melchiſedec* offered an unbloody Sacrifice, for when he went to meet *Abraham* returning from the ſlaughter of the Kings, he offered to God Bread and Wine. And ſeeing

ing this Bread and Wine offered to God by *Melchisedec* were Signs and Types of Christ's Body and Blood, Jesus Christ was obliged to offer an unbloody Sacrifice, *viz.* his Body and blood under the species of Bread and Wine, which he did at the institution and celebration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, that so the reality of the thing typified might answer those shadows and Types. Secondly, That although *Melchisedec* had brought all this Bread and Wine for the refreshment of *Abraham* and his Army that returned from the slaughter of the Kings, yet he first offered it to God, and then gave it to them, that so they might partake of the sacrifice of Bread and Wine. And the reason of this is, because the Scripture saith that *Abraham* returned from the Battle with great spoils, among which there was meat and drink enough for the refreshment of himself and his People: also it saith expresly that *Abraham*'s People had taken such refreshment as was necessary before *Melchisedec* met them, and consequently they had no need of the Bread and Wine which he brought, except it had been to partake of the Sacrifice of the Bread and Wine which he of-

fered. Thirdly, They ſay this is ſtrongly proved by the following words, *for he was Prieſt of the moſt high God*, which ſhews the reaſon why *Melchiſedec* brought Bread and Wine, *viz.* to make an oblation or offering of it to God; for if he had brought this Bread and Wine for the refreſhment of *Abraham* and his People, the Scripture would have ſaid that he had brought this Bread and Wine becauſe that *Abraham* and his Army being faint and tired, had need of meat and drink; but it ſpeaks nothing of this: On the contrary it ſaith that he brought Bread and Wine, *for he was Prieſt*. Fourthly, They ſay that *Jeſus Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever, after the order of Melchiſedec*; and ſeeing there can be no Prieſt without a Sacrifice, there can be no eternal Prieſt without an eternal or perpetual Sacrifice. But the Sacrifice of the Croſs was offered but once, and cannot be reiterated, *for Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more*, Rom. 6. Therefore there muſt be another perpetual Sacrifice in the Church, which Jeſus Chriſt offereth by the hands of Prieſts, which can be nothing elſe but the Sacrifice of the Maſs, *viz.* the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body and Blood under the ſpecies.

cies of the Bread and Wine, typified by the Sacrifice of the Bread and Wine of *Melchiſedec*.

Anſwer.

21. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That the Hebrew word doth not ſignifie *bringing* but *brought*, drew out, cauſed to be brought, *&c.* but our Adverſaries falſifie the Text thus, to make way for another falſification, *viz.* to put theſe words in a Parentheſis, (*for he was Prieſt*;) inſtead of putting without a Parentheſis, *and he was a Prieſt*; ſo that we may ſay in theſe few words they have made three falſifications; firſt, when they tranſlate it *profereus*, that is bringing, inſtead of tranſlating it *protulit*, that is brought or drew out: Secondly, when they tranſlate it *erat enim Sacerdos*, that is, *for he was a Prieſt*: in ſtead of tranſlating it, *and he was a Prieſt*. Thirdly, when they tranſlate it *benedixit ei*, that is, *bleſſed him*, inſtead of tranſlating it *& benedixit ei*, that is *and he bleſſed him*. And ſo of three different propoſitions, *viz.* *Melchiſedec* alſo brought Bread and Wine, and he was Prieſt, and he bleſſed him; they

they have made but one, with a Parentheſis, thus: *Melchiſedec* bringing Bread and Wine (for he was a Prieſt) bleſſed him.

22. Secondly, I anſwer that the Hebrew word uſed by *Moſes*, ſignifies commonly brought, drew out, cauſed to be brought, cauſed to be drawn out, cauſed to come, *&c.* But we muſt not ſtray from the proper ſignification of words but upon very great neceſſity, which appears not in this Text. And although this Hebrew word ſhould ſignifie *brought to offer*, and that it ſhould be taken for *offered*, yet our Adverſaries would gain nothing by it; for it is not ſaid in the Text that he brought Bread and Wine to offer unto God; but we muſt rather expound it thus, *viz.* that he brought Bread and Wine to offer and preſent it to *Abraham*: And indeed the following words, *viz. and bleſſed him*, do clearly ſhew it, for the Pronoun Relative *him*, relates to *Abraham*, according to the expoſition of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 7. where he ſaith expreſly that *Melchiſedec met Abraham and bleſſed him.* And a little after he ſaith, that *Melchiſedec bleſſed him that had the promiſes; and that the leſs is bleſſed of the*

greater

greater. But if theſe words, *he brought Bread and Wine*, muſt be expounded thus, he offered Bread and Wine to God, then it muſt neceſſarily follow that *Melchiſedec* bleſſed God and not *Abraham*; for in theſe words, *viz.* he offered Bread and Wine to God, and bleſſed him, the Pronoun *him* can relate to none but God.

23. Thirdly, I anſwer, That *Melchiſedec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his People, and not to offer unto God. *Bellarmine* in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs*, *chap.* 6. confeſſeth that *Melchiſedec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his People, who returned faint and tired from the ſlaughter of the Kings. which is true; but he adds that Jeſus Chriſt had offered it to God before, which is falſe, and cannot be proved. *Jerom in his* Epiſtle to *Evagrius* writes that the Jews underſtood it that *Melchiſedec* meeting *Abraham* after his victory, brought Bread and Wine to refreſh him and his People, *Joſephus* writing this Hiſtory, ſaith that *Melchiſedec* preſented Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his Army. *Damaſcene*, *Book* 4. of the *Orthodox Faith*, ſaith, that *Melchiſedec* treated *Abraham* with Bread and Wine.

24. Fourthly, The Reasons of our Adversaries, mentioned in the Objections to prove that *Melchedisec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* that he might partake of the Sacrifice which he had offered, are not considerable; *viz.* because *Abraham* returned from the Battle with great spoils and so there was meat and drink enough for him and his People; and that they had taken their repast before *Melchisedec* met them, *&c.* These Reasons, I say, are inconsiderable, because although *Abraham* had great spoils, yet he restored all to the King of *Sodom*, and though his People had eaten and drank of such as they found amongst the spoils, yet it is not said that *Abraham* did eat and drink; and though both he and his People had eaten and drank, yet it is not said how long it was since, and that they had no need of more provision; and though they had no need of more, yet *Melchisedec* not knowing that they had eaten and drank, did that which prudent men are wont to do, *viz.* provide all that may be needful in case of necessity.

35. Fifthly, I answer, that the principal reason which our Adversaries bring

to

to prove that *Melchesedec* offered unto God Bread and Wine, *viz.* because it is in the Hebrew Text, *for he was Priest*, is a manifest falsification; for it is in the Hebrew Text, *and he was Priest*. Also the old Latine Interpreter, and the Greek Septuagint translate it as we do, *viz. and he was Priest*. And it is very probable that this passage hath been corrupted in *Jeram*'s Latine Translation, because in his Hebrew Questions, and in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, he translates it, *and he was Priest*. St. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Caecilius*, and St. *Augustin*, Book 4. of *Christian Doctrine*, chap. 12. and elsewhere translate it, *and he was Priest*. So that although the Hebrew particle used by *Moses*, do sometimes signifie, *for*, yet seeing that both its proper and common signification is *and*; and for that one place where it signifies for, there are a thousand at least where it signifies *and*; and that there is nothing that obligeth us to translate it *for*, it is evident that the Argument of our Adversaries is of no force at all. Therefore it is more pertinent to refer these words, *and he was Priest*, to what follows, *viz.* *and blessed him*, than to what goes before, *viz.*

brought

brought Bread and Wine. For as *Melchisedec*, being a liberal King, brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham*, to refresh him and his people; so, as he was a Priest much more excellent than *Abraham*, he blessed him. And though it should be translated *for he was Priest*, yet it would not follow that *Melchisedec* did Sacrifice Bread and Wine unto God, for it might be said that *Moses* would shew the reason of the good will of *Melchisedec* toward *Abraham*; viz. it was very fit that he that was Priest of the most high God, should testifie his kindness to so eminent a servant of God as was *Abraham*, by presenting Bread and Wine to him, whereof he thought there was need.

726. Sixthly, I answer, That from what is said, *Psal.* 110. and *Heb.* 7. viz. that Jesus Christ is a Priest for ever, it will not follow that he must offer himself every day in the Mass, under the species of Bread and Wine, by the Ministry of Priests; for the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the perpetuity of the Priesthood partly in this, *viz.* that there is no need he should be offered any more, seeing by one oblation he hath consecrated for ever those that are sanctified; and

partly

partly in this, *viz.* that being exalted far above the Heavens, he intercedes continually for us; for the Prieſthood conſiſts in certain functions, and in the vertue and efficacy of them. And ſeeing there are two parts of Chriſt's Prieſthood, whereof one relates to the oblation of himſelf, which he offered on the Croſs; and the other to his interceſſion; it is certain that the vertue and efficacy of the oblation is eternal, and that the interceſſion will continue unto the end of the World.

27. Seventhly, I anſwer, That in all the Holy Scripture where the Prieſthood of *Melchiſedec* is ſpoken of, three things only are mentioned of him, *viz.* that he was a Prieſt, that he was a Prieſt for ever, and that he was ſo with an oath, according to the Application that is made of it to Jeſus Chriſt in *Pſal.* 110. and *Heb.* 7. in theſe words, *The Lord hath ſworn and will not repent, thou art a Prieſt for ever, after the order of* Melchiſedec; but there is nothing at all ſpoken of the Sacrifice of *Melchiſedec*, nor is it ſaid wherein it did conſiſt: for as it was fit that all the offices which we find, were born by the greateſt Kings, Prieſts, and Prophets under the old Teſtament, ſhould be

be collected in the Person of *Messiah*; which was done by proposing them as Types and Figures of Jesus Christ; and that the most illustrious Type was *Melchisedec*; so it was more expedient not to speak of the nature of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, because it was not expedient then to speak of the nature of the Sacrifice of the Messiah. And therefore although we know not the nature and quality of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, yet we know that he was a Priest: Even as we know not in what manner he executed his Kingly office.

28. Lastly, I answer, that it is false that the difference between the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* and that of *Aaron* did consist in this, *viz.* that *Aaron* offered the bloody sacrifices of Beasts, and *Melchisedec* offered an unbloody Sacrifice of Bread and Wine. It is also false that the likeness of the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* to that of Jesus Christ doth consist in this, *viz.* that as *Melchisedec* did sacrifice Bread and Wine, so Christ did sacrifice his Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine: these are humane inventions, and are founded neither on Scripture nor Reason, for on the

contrary,

contrary, the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the difference between the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* and that of *Aaron*, and its likeness to that of Christ is quite another thing. First, He is called *Melchisedec*, which being interpreted (as the Apostle saith, *Heb.* 7.) is King of Righteousness; and then King of *Salem*, that is, King of Peace; and herein he very well represents our Lord Jesus Christ, who is truly King of Righteousness, not only because he is Righteous, and was always without sin; but also because by his satisfaction he hath purchased Righteousness for us, *being made unto us of God, Righteousness.* He is also truly King of Peace, in that he hath reconciled men unto God, made their peace with the Angels, and hath particularly recommended peace to them. As for *Aaron* and other High Priests, they were no Kings, much less are the Priests of the *Romish* Church so, and consequently cannot be after the order of *Melchisedec*; and they that have written the lives of the Popes have sufficiently declared what Righteousness and Peace they have procured for the true and faithful servants of Jesus Christ, as I shall shew at large else-

elsewhere. Secondly, The Apostle, *Heb.* 7. represents *Melchisedec* to us as a man come from Heaven, *without Father, without Mother, without descent, having neither beginning of daies, nor end of Life*: not that he was really such a one, but because *Moses* hath wholly concealed from us his Father, Mother, Descent, Birth and Death, that he might be the Type of Christ, who was without Father, as he is Man; without Mother as God; without Descent both as God and as man; having neither beginning of daies as God, nor end of life as God, or as Man. But the Fathers, Descent, Birth, Death of *Aaron*, and other High Priests are exactly described by *Moses*. And there were never any Popes, Bishops, or Priests, whose Parents, Birth, and Death, were not known, and consequently they cannot be after the Order of *Melchisedec*. Thirdly, The Apostle adds, that *Melchisedec being made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest for ever*; because *Moses* makes no mention of his Death, nor of any one that succeeded him in his Priestly Office, that so he might be the Type of Jesus Christ, who never left his Priestly Office, but will exercise it until the end of the World,

always

always interceding for those that are his, by presenting his Sacrifice to God the Father continually. *As for Aaron* and other Priests they are dead, and have had successors. And the Popes, Bishops, and Priests, die daily, and have successors; and consequently are not after the order of *Melchisedec*. Fourthly, The Apostle saith likewise, that *Melchisedec* took Tithes of *Abraham*, and adds that *Melchisedec* blessed him that had the Promises, *viz. Abraham*; and that the less is blessed of the greater. Whence it appears that *Melchisedec*, having taken Tithes of *Abraham*, and blessed him, and *Levi*, and all the Priests in his person, was more excellent than *Abraham*, *Levi*, and all the Priests: In which respect he was a Type of Jesus Christ, who was infinitely more excellent than *Abraham* and his successors, because he in whom all the promises were fulfilled, must needs be incomparably more excellent than he that received them only. But I do not believe that the Priests of of the *Romish* Church are so bold as to prefer themselves before *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, in whose Seed all the nations of the earth are blessed; and consequently are not after the Order of

Melchi-

Melchisedec. Fifthly, The Apostle never spake of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, so far was he from comparing it with the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, as being like it, or with that of *Aaron*, as being unlike it, so that all that our Adversaries say of it, is nothing else but meer human invention.

29. I conclude my answer with this Argument, Jesus Christ hath offered no Sacrifice but after the order whereof he was established a Priest: But he was established a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec* only, as the Apostle observes: Therefore he hath offered no sacrifice but after the Order of *Melchisedec*: But (according to the *Romish* Doctors) there is no other Sacrifice after the Order of *Melchisedec*, but that of the Mass: Therefore (according to the *Romish* Doctors) Jesus Christ hath offered no other Sacrifice but that of the Mass. And seeing (according to them) the Sacrifice of the Mass is an unbloody Sacrifice, it follows that Jesus Christ hath offered no other Sacrifice, but an unbloody Sacrifice, and consequently he hath not offered a bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy.

THE END.